



Handwritten signature or mark, possibly initials, consisting of several overlapping, curved lines.

CONTEMPORARY ESSAYS IN THEOLOGY

CONTEMPORARY ESSAYS
IN THEOLOGY

BY THE REV. JOHN HUNT

AUTHOR OF 'AN ESSAY ON PANTHEISM,' 'HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN ENGLAND,' ETC.

STRAHAN & CO.
56, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON
1873

[The Right of Translation is reserved.]

LONDON :
PRINTED BY VIRTUE AND CO.,
CITY ROAD.

PREFACE.

THE following Essays are mostly reprinted from the 'Contemporary Review.' It has been said that the only two subjects worthy the attention of a wise man are religion and government. These are, as nearly as possible, the subjects of this volume. It is mainly occupied with discussions which concern Christianity and the State Establishment of Christianity in England. I have tried to avoid the tone of the dogmatist, and to cultivate rather the spirit of an inquirer; I would say sceptic, if that good old word had not been unfairly doomed to an unfortunate meaning. Sometimes in pushing arguments to their last results, my wish has been rather to make tentative suggestions than to express my own final views. A new apprehension of the meaning of Christianity is imperative; but I pretend to little more than showing its necessity.

The question of the National Church I have tried to examine in the same way as the questions which immediately concern Christianity. The method is to start from facts, to follow reason, and to advocate what reason dictates as best to be done. In the Church of England we have a powerful machinery,

which no one who regards the interests of the nation could wish to see destroyed. The plea for disestablishment is the renovation and not the destruction of the Church. The answer is, that disestablishment in the circumstances would be something like destruction. On the other hand it is admitted that there are crying evils in the Church, and these are so bound up with the existing establishment that the removal of them is hopeless while the present connection between Church and State continues. The grievance of which the Nonconformist complains, that a State Church is the cause of his social inferiority, I regard as imaginary. But even if it were real, so long as a State Church is a public good, his objection would justly be set aside. It is a subject which concerns Churchmen far more than Nonconformists, and ought to be fairly discussed, irrespective of external agitation.

The best defences of the State Church are those which have been put forth by the Primate and the Dean of Westminster. And yet no two men in England are more insensible to the necessity of the only reformation which could both secure the greater efficiency of the Church and save it from disestablishment. So long as Church patronage can be bought and sold, or so long as it is vested in individuals, to be used at their discretion to provide for their relatives and friends, so long there will be an evil demanding immediate reformation. The Archbishop of Canterbury seems so much afraid of the people having any voice in the election of their clergyman, that the *Times* lately described him as even hastening from a visitation

to help some vicar in Dover to get the patronage of a living out of the hands of the parishioners. The one great blemish in Dean Stanley's Lectures on the Church of Scotland is his failure to appreciate the Free Church movement. The Church of Scotland, which, till that time, had always embraced the mass of the people, was being threatened with the same evil which has long been passively endured in the Church of England. The patrons were thrusting men upon parishes without any regard to the special wants of these parishes or to the wishes of the people. The Dean seems to think the Free Church cause sufficiently refuted by the fact that Achterarder, the scene of the original conflict, after a few years, settled into a haven of perfect peace. And so, to my knowledge, has many an English parish after a similar presentation; but it has been the peace of death. The people either become Nonconformists, or they cease to take an interest in anything that concerns the Church.

The one great advantage of the Church of England at the present hour is its indifference to theological dogmas. It is only a State Church that could secure the freedom which is now enjoyed by the English clergy. It is only a State Church which could give the laity this practical lesson that religion consists in something that we are to be and to do, and not in holding some speculative opinions, about which men may differ for ever. There is not, however, much of which we can boast even in this. The Primate, in his recent charge, has told us that it is only in the Church of England that such men as Frederick Robertson and Frederick Denison Maurice could have found a

home. It is quite true they would have been silenced in the Church of Rome, and they would have been fettered in any sect of Nonconformists; but, after all, the shelter which the Church of England gave them was but the casual ward for wayfaring men. Their lives were the lives of martyrs, 'afflicted, persecuted, tormented.' Frederick Robertson never had any preferment, but ministered in a proprietary chapel. It is true he died young; but Maurice was almost forty years in orders, and never held any higher preferment than a church, of which the income was derived from pew rents; and this at a time when for the most part the canonries and deaneries, to say nothing of the bishoprics, were held by men whose names would sound like the very essence of emptiness. No bishop ever dared to give preferment to Frederick Denison Maurice. It is well to mark the advantages we have in the Church of England, but they are the best friends of the Church who are not afraid to confess that there are many things which might be improved.

N.B. The notes marked X did not appear in the Review.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. THE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND	1
II. NATURE-DEVELOPMENT AND THEOLOGY	45
III. BROAD CHURCH CATHOLICS	78
IV. DR. PUSEY AND THE ULTRAMONTANES	109
V. DEAN STANLEY'S ESSAYS ON CHURCH AND STATE	142
VI. SPECULATIVE THEOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIANITY OF CHRIST	164
VII. THE BISHOPS AND THE REVISION OF THE BIBLE	190
VIII. REPUBLICS, CIVIL AND SOCIAL	216
IX. CHRISTIANITY AND MODERN EVIDENCES	244
X. GERMAN THEOLOGY: ITS PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGION	282
XI. RECENT ECCLESIASTICAL JUDGMENTS	314
XII. FRENCH PROTESTANTISM	342
XIII. A VISIT TO MUNICH.	376
XIV. THE JANSENISTS AND THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH OF UTRECHT	395
XV. THE OLD CATHOLIC CONGRESS	413
XVI. THE OLD CATHOLIC MOVEMENT.	437
XVII. CATHOLICS AND CATHOLICS	461
XVIII. AN EARNEST MINISTER	495
XIX. THE EDUCATION OF THE CLERGY	506

Errata.—By an oversight the proofs of pp. 414-5 were not corrected. On p. 414, l. 17 and 20, for Rheinkens, read Reinkens; l. 19, for Rensch, read Reusch; on p. 415, l. 4, read the two German words, Geistlicher Aufklärung; l. 17, after 'arrived,' add in Bonn.

I.

THE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND.*

DURING the last two years Sion College has been emerging from the obscurity in which for two long centuries it has lain concealed. When the Dean of Westminster's address on the connection of Church and State was the subject of comment in the daily papers, everybody was asking, Where is Sion College? and very few people were able to answer. The great world of London has migrated without the City, and the few dingy buildings which form the library, chapel, and almshouses of this ancient foundation are scarcely to be distinguished from the shops and ware-

* Contemporary Review, April, 1870.

The Freedom of Opinion necessary in an Established Church in a Free Country. An Address delivered at Sion College, by SIR JOHN DUKE COLERIDGE. Macmillan's Magazine, March, 1870.

An Address on the Connection of Church and State. Delivered at Sion College, Feb. 18, 1868. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster. Macmillan & Co.

The Three Irish Churches. An Address delivered at Sion College, Jan. 28, 1869. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster. John Murray.

A Lecture on the Characteristics of Charitable Foundations in England. Delivered at Sion College on March 12, 1868. By ARTHUR HOBHOUSE, Q.C. Longman, Green, & Co.

The National Church. Edinburgh Review, July, 1868.

The Church and her Curates. Quarterly Review, July, 1867.

Clergymen made Scarce. A Letter to the Bishop of London. By a PRESBYTER. 1867. Second Edition. Hall & Co.

The Present Dangers of the Church of England. By W. G. CLARK, M.A., Vice-Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. Macmillan & Co., 1870.

houses by which they are surrounded. In the seventeenth century it was the favourite resort of the London ministers. In the troubled times of the Long Parliament and the Commonwealth it was here they met to sign leagues and covenants, and to make ordinances against 'Popery, Prelacy, Arianism, Socinianism,' and every other conceivable heresy, known or unknown. Even so late as the Savoy Conference the London clergy, who were mostly on the side of the Puritans, had their special meetings at Sion College. Two years ago the Rector of Bishopsgate was President. Besides some other salutary reforms and improvements, he began the custom of 'Evening Meetings,' which have been continued by his successors in the presidency. At these meetings papers have been read on various subjects. Of these the most important are those which concern the National Church.

From many different quarters the question of the State Church is forced upon the public mind. Outside, there is the Roman Catholic, the avowed enemy of the Church of England, working ceaselessly for its overthrow. The 'Liberation' Dissenter is scarcely less active in his opposition to the Church of England so far as it is a State institution. The High Churchman is daily becoming less satisfied with the strong Protestantism of the Church's standards, while the advancing thought of our day is rendering it impossible for some other men to be bound by the rigid formularies of a past age. One other item of antagonism, silent, indeed, but more important than all the others, is the steady and uniform growth of Dissent.

It is true that some of the religious difficulties of our time are common both to Churchmen and Dissenters. Which of the two shall best be able to meet them is one of the questions at issue.

The old objections to State churches, as well as the arguments in their defence, to which we have been accustomed for the last thirty years, may now be set aside as irrelevant. It is not a question either of the duty of the State to support the truth, or of the sufficiency or insufficiency of the voluntary principle. In the hands of Dr. Stanley the controversy assumes a new aspect. The State Church becomes not, as it was supposed to be, an institution for the arrest of civil and religious liberty, but for their advancement. The object is not to crush the Dissenter by opposition, but if possible to comprehend him, and where that is impossible, to secure for him toleration and equality.* This view of a State Church is not something taken up merely to meet a present difficulty. It is connected with a theology which regards the Divine Being as carrying on His work of education by slow and silent progress in individuals, families, and nations. Its advocates are willing that the State Church principle be examined and tried by the experience of the past, not for a moment denying the many evils and imperfections inseparably connected with it, yet maintaining that it is the best

* The plea of the Anti-State Churchman is, that there can be no equality but by the entire separation of Church and State. Our argument is, that such a separation is simply impossible. Every corporate body possessing great property must be under the control of the State. The objection that the State endows the Church of England is another phase of the question, raising that of the origin of Church property, and must be discussed by itself.—X.

within our reach. The history of the past seems to say that no other was possible; that the growth of the Church in any State inevitably implied its connection with the State. What the circumstances of the future may be must be left to the future to declare.

When people speak of a State Church they often forget that the connection between Church and State has not always been the same. When we take a concrete Church, as that of England, Scotland, or Ireland, and say that it is to be disestablished, we have immediately to state the items which make up what we consider disestablishment. In the case of the Church of Ireland it consisted mainly in excluding a few bishops from the House of Lords, who, indeed, had not permanent seats, and in leaving the Church to choose its own officers. The deprivation of a third of the Church's property was called disendowment, and reckoned something quite distinct from disestablishment. There was added the public declaration of the Government of the country that the Church in Ireland was no longer a State Church. It was this which constituted it a disestablished Church, so far as it is disestablished. It was left in possession of two-thirds of its property and all its churches, some of which are to be kept in repair by the Government, as in some special sense belonging to the nation. State establishment in its first and simplest form is when the State allows the Church as a corporate body to hold property. The next form is when the State interferes to regulate that property, or to put restrictions upon it. Another form is when the State directly gives property to the Church. The State connection may be where the State simply pro-

fects the Church; or where an alliance is made between the Church and the State, with fixed terms of agreement. It may be where the State constitutes the Church; or where the State, as the supreme ruler of all communities as well as of all individuals in the realm, is the final judge of differences in the Church. In one or more of these forms, every sect or religious body in any State is a State Church. There can be no abstract definition of a State Church. In every case it is a question of degree. Disestablishment, therefore, can only mean a re-adjustment of the present relations between the Church and the State.

The history of the Church in England would furnish examples of all, and more than all, these forms of State connection. When the missionaries came to the Saxon kingdoms, they first obtained permission to preach. As they made converts they built churches and began to gather property. In the condition of society which then existed, when a ruler became Christian it would be a great step towards the conversion of his kingdom. Christian kings, by taking the side of the preachers of Christianity, thereby made Christianity the State religion. As centuries passed, and the property of the Church accumulated, the civil power had to devise new restrictions on property left to the Church, which became equivalent to an assertion of right to control it. As the Papal claims to supremacy increased, so did the antagonism between the ecclesiastical and the civil authorities. The King and the Pope both claimed to be head of the Church in England. Henry VIII. vigorously took possession of what his predecessors had always claimed, but

not always with equal decision. He rejected entirely the Papal supremacy. If his daughter Mary brought it back, it was even then in the way of alliance. Queen Elizabeth again exorcised the Bishop of Rome. This time the Papal claims were effectually dealt with, for not only the Pope, but the Pope's religion, was driven out of England. The relations of the Church and State were changed. The Pope's Church was disestablished. A new Church, to speak politically, was created. To speak ecclesiastically, a corrupted Church was reformed. Under Elizabeth the connection between Church and State was of the closest kind. The Church was then moulded into a political institution. Out of the confiscated revenues of the unreformed Church the new Church was endowed. Had the Bishop of Rome been the harmless and politically helpless individual that he is to-day, Queen Elizabeth's Church might have assumed a different form. But with the great power of the Papacy planning for the overthrow of her kingdom, she was compelled to repress with an iron hand the Romanist without and the Puritan within. Liberty of conscience, it is often said, was not understood in those days; but it was impossible that it could be either understood or practised so long as the national life was endangered by the great political power of the Church of Rome. The Puritan felt the oppression of State tyranny, and groaned under it. More freedom might have been given him according to our judgment now, but not so in the judgment of Queen Elizabeth. The Puritan wanted to be under a government distinct from that of the State. He wanted to obey God rather than

man, when he thought that the divine and the royal commands were not in harmony. But no civil power ever permitted this, when it feared danger to its own existence. Christianity and the moral constitution of man have their foundation in right; but all civil government depends on might. The great 'Leviathan,' to use the illustration of Thomas Hobbes, must first secure its own existence before it can yield protection or liberty to the individual members of whom it is composed. All liberty to the subjects of any commonwealth must be measured by its compatibility with the safety of that commonwealth. This we apprehend was what Hobbes meant when he said that religion, morality, and law have their origin from the State.

Since the time of Queen Elizabeth the connection between Church and State has been nominally the same, yet actually it has been very different at different times. Under James and the first Charles a great part of the spiritual power denied to the Pope was put into the hands of the bishops. James I. was content that the bishops should be bishops by divine right, so long as he was acknowledged a king by divine right. This confederation of the king and the bishops ended in a revolution. A new Church, politically, was established under the Commonwealth. This Church was as much the creation of the State, and as completely under it, as the Church had been under Elizabeth. The 'Leviathan' was again compelled to rule with might. Under the second Charles the bishops regained some of their ecclesiastical power. Under the second James the State Church resisted the

State, and obeyed God rather than man. It willingly served the Prince of Orange. It was fostered and strengthened by Queen Anne. Under the Georges it became the instrument of political parties. Since then the State has been gradually receding from interference with ecclesiastical matters. The State connection to-day is very different from what it was in the time of Queen Elizabeth.

The principle on which the Reformed Church of England was established under Elizabeth is sometimes said to have been a comprehension; but this is an ingenious theory rather than a fact. The Thirty-nine Articles plainly speak the language of the Augustinian theology which was adopted by the Swiss Reformers. Many of the bishops, in whose hands Elizabeth placed the government of the Church, had been in exile, and were full of the theology of Calvin. The old priests who had conformed to the Roman Catholic religion under Mary were allowed to remain under Elizabeth, but only on condition of their subscribing the Articles, and teaching the doctrines set forth in the Homilies. The Pope and the Pope's peculiar dogmas were excluded. The Reformers under Queen Elizabeth did not differ as to doctrines, but only as to ceremonies, and in these a rigid conformity was enforced and no latitude allowed. The 'comprehension' appears to have been the result of circumstances rather than of intention. It was not till the time of Charles I. that the Church of England was wide enough to admit the Arminian High Churchmen, who came in, not by permission, but by mere might. New necessities demanded the comprehension of different parties. With

the High Churchmen came in such Rationalists as Hales and Chillingworth. At the restoration of Charles II., though the Nonconformists, who had scruples about the ceremonies, were excluded, yet the Church was made wider. It embraced many of the Presbyterians, who were allowed to subscribe with an express permission to make an explanation of the sense in which they understood the formularies. It also embraced the Latitudinarians, whose views of Church polity and ceremonies agreed with those of Elizabeth's divines, but differed from those of the High Churchmen, and whose doctrines, like those of the High Churchmen, were at variance with those of the Calvinists, which are properly those of the Articles of Religion. As an historical fact, the Church of England has become a Broad Church. Is it broad enough? Or, what is perhaps a more correct form of the question, can it bear to be made broader?

Sir John Coleridge distinctly declares that it is not his wish to change the formularies of the Church of England. His position is the matter-of-fact one, that if the Church is to embrace the thought of the nation some changes must be made.

'An Established Church,' he says, 'in a free country must take note of and represent the religion of that country, and if the religious opinion of the country is various, the Church must contain a variety of religious opinions. No doubt it is a question of degree in which it is hard to draw the line. It is enough for me to say that the limits must be drawn far more widely than most people are prepared to draw them. It is idle to rave against the intellect, and to endeavour by tests to convert the deductions of clerical theology into necessary Christian truths. It is to my mind as certain as anything can be, which is contingent, that if the Church remains established it will remain so by the sacrifice of its present

tests. Do not suppose, however, that this future, which I think inevitable, is what in itself I desire, or that it appears to me all good unmixed with evil.'

The history of the Church of England shows, we have said, that it is a Broad Church by the force of circumstances, rather than by choice. The State which, under Elizabeth and James, tried to reduce all to uniformity of doctrine, was afterwards compelled to include all without uniformity. The same formularies remained, and they were subscribed according to the sense in which each party understood them. While the State allows subscription of this kind, it cannot be fairly said that there is any moral obliquity in the act of subscribing. But to him that thinketh it sin, to him it is sin. There are men to whom subscription has been a burden—men who have thought that by subscription they were bound to believe, or to profess belief, in every statement of the Articles, even though it might be something which is now plainly disproved, or which no rational man believes. The usual view of subscription is, that the subscribers are bound by the sense of the imposers. The High Churchmen, who were the first to depart from the literal and grammatical sense of the Articles, yet claimed agreement with them. It was in the time of Laud, and with the object of favouring his party, that 'His Majesty's Declaration' was prefixed to the Articles, forbidding any man to put 'his own sense or comment' upon them. It was impossible that this deception could be long concealed. The theology of High Churchmen was utterly at variance with the theology of the standards of the Church of England.

When the party had reasoned itself into its legitimate position it was avowed that there had been a departure from the Articles. Tract XC. advocated the principle that the clergy are not bound by the original meaning of the Articles if another meaning with which they agree can be put upon them.

It appears that there are men still dissatisfied with subscription. The formularies of the Church are not in harmony with modern ideas. The complaint of the bishops of the decrease of candidates for orders increases with every ordination. And those that do present themselves for ordination are not what is called the 'good men' of the Universities. The desire of Mr. Clark, the Public Orator of the University of Cambridge, to renounce his orders, and the resignation of Mr. Sedley Taylor, another Fellow of Trinity, are but visible signs of what is invisible to the unobservant world. The progress which has been made in Bible criticism forbids educated men to view the Bible as it was viewed by the Reformers and theologians of the sixteenth century. Are men to subscribe formularies with the proviso that they do not entirely believe what they subscribe, or are these tests to be abolished?

Sir John Coleridge dealt only with one of the difficulties that beset the Church of England. The question of subscription is only a temporary affliction—an acute disease in the body ecclesiastical. But the Church has an old chronic affliction which it has borne for centuries, and with as little hope of being healed as the woman had who spent her all on physicians. This complaint may be called the patronage of Church

livings, including, as it does in England, the sale of benefices, and every other conceivable evil that may follow the triumph of Mammon in the Church. Such names as Julio de Medicis and Jerome de Ghinucci, among the pre-Reformation bishops, are connected with histories which tell us that the patronage of the Church was not better administered under the Popes than it was after the Reformation. Not better, we say; yet it was scarcely possible to have been much worse. Under Henry, Elizabeth, and James, many of the bishops obtained their bishoprics only on condition of giving up large portions of the episcopal revenues to the king or the nobles. The ordinary mode of obtaining a benefice was by making a bargain with the patron, either to give him a certain sum of money or an annual payment out of the income of the living. 'The disease spreadeth,' said Archbishop Sandys; 'for patrons gape for gain, and hungry fellows, destitute of all good learning and godly zeal, yea, scarcely clothed with common honesty, having money, find ready entrance to the Church.' Bishop Jewel says, 'The masters of the work build benefice upon benefice, and deanery upon deanery, as if Rome were still in England.' 'Non-residences,' said John Penry, 'have cut the throat of our Church.' Dr. Robert Some, of Cambridge, said, 'The sale and merchandise of Church livings is cried out against in court, city, and university. It is so common that it cannot, and so shameless that it will not be hid.' The same thing might have been said at every period of the three hundred years that have intervened since the days of Bishop Jewel and Dr. Robert Some. And to

this day the sale of livings and making merchandise of the souls of men, is as common and as shameless as ever.

That the traffic in Church livings has not ceased, we are reminded by the advertising columns of almost every daily or weekly paper. A recent number of the *Ecclesiastical Gazette*, which is circulated gratuitously among the clergy, has eight or nine columns filled entirely with advertisements of advowsons and next presentations for sale. Six or seven ecclesiastical agents, in the open blaze of the daylight, advertise for purchasers of 'Church preferment,' and call attention to their 'private registers,' forwarded on 'confidential application.' One agent says that he has 'one hundred Church preferments for sale,' and that he has registered the requirements of 'three hundred clients fully prepared to purchase.' Any one curious to be initiated into the mysteries of buying the care or cure of souls, has only to enclose two stamps, and the 'private register' is forwarded by the next post. The second step is to enter on a correspondence with 'them that sell.' The recommendations of the different livings are of various kinds. Some have very aged incumbents; some have pleasant neighbourhoods; some are near watering-places; others have trout streams, small populations, good society, and—the culmination of clerical blessedness—'no Dissenters.' For one or two thousand pounds any clergyman may buy himself a Goshen, with the prospect of 'immediate possession.'

A stranger, that is, a secular person unused to clerical ideas, might suppose, previous to experience

to the contrary, that the life of a clergyman was one of entire disinterestedness and self-devotion. He may have heard of Apostles that went forth to convert the world without scrip or purse for their journey, and he may have wondered at their simplicity. But when he knows something of the mode of obtaining a benefice in the Church of England, he will see that the trade of preaching is not altogether foolishness. It is difficult to understand how the English people, so eager for reform, and so deeply interested in all national institutions, should so long have endured the maladministration of the property of the Church. It has become appropriated by a class. Livings descend with families. A prudent man who sends his son to the university, at the same time secures for him an advowson or a next presentation. It is one of the profitable ways of investing money. Doing the work of the Church is only a secondary consideration, even when it is a consideration at all. Incumbents are now compelled by law to reside on their benefices; but what comes by compulsion has never the value of what is done with a willing heart. So recent as the early part of this century there was no law to enforce the residence of the holder of a living. In 1810, out of the 9,754 incumbents of livings in the Church of England, according to a Parliamentary return 5,395 did not reside in their parishes. They did no work; they simply received the tithes and rents, leaving their spiritual duties to be performed by stipendiary curates.* This represents so many thousands of men

* This argument is not quite correct. Some were pluralists, and did work in one parish.—X.

becoming clergymen for no other end than to enjoy the honours and the emoluments of their office.

There is another aspect of the preferment purchase question which has not received much attention, because the facts connected with it do not often come to light. Some men have money to buy, or their friends have money to buy for them. But there are other men who merely speculate. Any unscrupulous man may get a living if he has sufficient courage to make a venture, or sufficient want of principle to render him insensible to the results that may possibly follow. The modes of raising money are the same as in other cases where a man speculates without capital. The only difference is that in buying a living he must strive to evade the law against simony. The effect of this law, like that of tests, is to keep out the man who has a tender conscience, while to other men it is no hindrance. The writer of 'Clergymen made Scarce,' who seems to have passed through every phase of clerical life on the unbeneficed side, speaks of a correspondence which he had with an incumbent who was to sell his right to presentation and immediately retire.

'This living was worth £900 a year, one half from tithe and the other from pew rents. The sum wanted was £5,000, and immediate possession. I said that I was quite inexperienced in these matters. £5,000 was a large sum, supposing I had as much, which I had not; it would be £250 a-year at five per cent., and the capital safe. But if I expend it on a next presentation, when I die I lose all. "The way to provide against that," said the rector, "is by a life insurance for the amount." "But it is a large sum," I repeated with emphasis. The rector replied that it was only what his wife paid to put him there. He wanted to spend a few years on the Continent, and when he returned, to lay out the money again on another living. I put my hand to my head, feeling instinctively, yet vaguely, that there was something more which I

ought to say. "Are we not," I asked, "in negotiating about this business, contemplating something illegal? Is there not an oath to be taken by the presentee calling God to witness that he has not used any means, direct or indirect, to get the presentation?" "There is such an oath," said the rector, "but the ecclesiastical agent's lawyer has a form by which the law can be evaded." "Evaded!" I said. "Nothing wrong," answered the rector. "I know excellent, upright men who have done it, and who would not have done it had it been wrong. Good men, both High Church and Evangelical, do it daily. It is quite common; nobody thinks it wrong."

The private arrangements that are made with patrons rarely come to light. They are not generally creditable to any of the parties, and frequently altogether illegal, except on the 'evasion' principle. There are cases where several persons are interested in the patronage, and the only mode of satisfying their claims is by dividing the money obtained for the presentation. The best bargains are sometimes made with clergymen who are themselves without property; but who receive loans by insurance policies and other available means. This sometimes involves them in debts and difficulties which embitter their lives, and bring lasting injury to their parishes. Cases of this kind are known to most clergymen and to all bishops. There are cases publicly known where men have got inducted into the livings, and after possession was obtained there was no money to be found to fulfil the agreement between them and the patrons. This has resulted in sequestration and suspension—with the benefice being served for long terms of years by stipendiary curates.

The livings which are not in private hands are in the patronage of the Crown, the Lord Chancellor, the

Bishops, the Colleges, the Cathedral Chapters, and the incumbents of other livings. Of these, the administration of those belonging to the Colleges is the least liable to objection. The men presented may not, in every case, be the best parish ministers; but, as a rule, they always have some appreciable merit. The crown livings are subject to the changes and caprices of different governments. Those in the gift of the Lord Chancellor are proverbially small, and are generally given to men who have been some years in the service of the Church. Dean and Chapter livings are disposed of either by the members of the chapter among themselves, or by presenting them in turns to their friends. Episcopal patronage is exercised in many different ways. One bishop studs his diocese with sons, nephews, and sons-in-law, putting them frequently into parishes for the management of which they have no earthly capacity, and making it a serious business for his successor to buy them out by giving them less important livings with larger incomes. Besides providing for his immediate relations, a bishop has often to remember the friends of the friends who in other days helped him. Until very lately, a Whig or a Tory bishop might be known by the preferment which he had given to members of Whig or Tory families. It is difficult for any ordinary observer to make out the principle on which a bishop acts in the distribution of his patronage. The probability is that many bishops, in order to act fairly, avoid following a principle at all. The amount of their patronage is too small to enable them to promote all the men whom they may want to promote, while their dioceses are too large

to enable them to know the merits of all their clergy. An intercessor is often needed, or a special introduction from some one who has access to the bishop. But this also may fail. There are bishops who give to 'every one that asketh,' and there are others that turn away just because they are asked. It is said that some bishops, when an important parish is vacant, are very careful in the choice of a clergyman to whom the preferment is to be given. Others reckon it a matter of the merest indifference, acting on the principle that one man, or at least one priest, is quite as good as another. Some of the appointments made by bishops bear evidence that the first names on the list have been taken without any consideration of the special requirements of the parish. Men that are no preachers are sometimes placed over congregations that can only be kept together by preaching. We have known men appointed to churches where it was not possible for them to be heard by one-half of the people; and the sole reason of the appointment may have been that they were the first to ask, or that they had a friend to intercede with the bishop for them. The last form of episcopal patronage is when a bishop promotes the men of his own party. There are many things to be said against this, but it argues that the bishop is doing his best, according to his light, to provide for the welfare of the parishes. In this way some dioceses are filled with 'Evangelical' incumbents, and others with those of the 'High-Church' party. Some men get preferment merely because they have taken up with earnestness the views of some particular bishop.

It is impossible to give the details of the multitude of channels into which Church property and Church patronage may flow. A clergyman who wrote lately to one of the weekly papers on the abuse of patronage, gave an account of seven parishes in the neighbourhood in which he lived. These may fairly be taken as an epitome of the whole system of patronage as now exercised in the Church of England. He says:—

‘The parish of which I am now curate was originally a Lord Chancellor’s living. It was bought by the wife of the present incumbent. This was a legal transaction, as some of the Lord Chancellor’s livings were recently sold in expectation that they would be bought by men of property, who would add something to their value. This parish is surrounded by six others. Into the present incumbencies of these I have made inquiries, as far as it was possible to get at transactions, some of which were in secret. The first was an ordinary case of next presentation, which was bought for a few hundred pounds thirty years ago at an auction in London. The second was a peculiar one. The present incumbent’s father had a living in the diocese worth £3,000 a year. The bishop wished to secure this living for a relative. The old rector agreed with the bishop to vacate this living on condition that one worth £900 a year were given to his son, who had just taken orders. The third parish was given to the present incumbent because the income was small, and he was a man of some private property. The fourth was a family living. The fifth was bought by the present incumbent’s friends, that is, by himself, while he was curate of a neighbouring parish. The sixth was a new district; the present incumbent contributed £2,000 towards building a church that he might have the first presentation.’

The last mode of buying oneself in furnishes an important part of the employment of the ecclesiastical agents. It is looked upon as the least sinful. It is encouraged by incumbents who want new churches built in their parishes, and it is defended by some because of the apparent gain which it brings to the

Church. It is said by those who profess to know that, but for this arrangement, many of the new churches in the suburbs of London would never have been built.

The acute disease of a narrow creed and the chronic affliction of abused patronage are threatening the life of the Church of England. Sir John Coleridge and some others ascribe the decrease of 'good men' from the universities to the tests required before ordination. There may be some truth in this, but the more probable cause is the uncertainty of the means of existence, not to say of fulfilling one's vocation, without having to deal in transactions from which every sincere and honest mind instinctively recoils. A certain number of men must be ordained, and if the best men of the universities refuse to take orders the bishops must be content with what they can get. If university men entirely fail, their place can be taken by 'literate,' or, what is worse still, by men who, without a proper school education, have had nothing but the meagre training of a theological college. The result is that the character of the clergy is visibly deteriorating. A few more years of the same downward course, and scholarship, gentlemanliness, and refinement will cease to be the marked qualifications of an English clergyman.

According to the last census, about one-half of the worshipping people of England were outside of the Established Church. They had formed themselves into distinct Churches. Alongside of the position of the Church of England it will be profitable to have a view of the actual condition of the religious communities outside of the Church. Among these are

included the Roman Catholics, who are not indeed a very numerous body; and, as their adherents are principally imported from Ireland, we may set them aside as not being one of the sects indigenious to England. For the same reason we exclude Presbyterians of all kinds. They are mainly importations from Scotland. We have left, as the chief sects, the Independents, Baptists, Unitarians, and Wesleyans.

The first three of these sects are the oldest; and, in one sense, the Unitarians are the oldest of the three, but, in another sense, the youngest. As Unitarians, they are modern; but under their other name of Presbyterians they are old. The principles of Presbyterianism were in the Church of England in the early part of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, perhaps with the very beginnings of the Reformation. They were chiefly adopted by the early Puritans. The Presbyterians came into power with the Long Parliament. Under Cromwell they gave place to the Independents. They were ejected in 1662 by the Act of Uniformity. The famous two thousand divines are represented to-day historically and lineally by two hundred Unitarian pastors. The decay of Presbyterianism in England is a history full of instruction to the student of religious tendencies. The aristocracy and landowners of the country were once divided between Presbyterianism and Conformity. So late as the early part of the last century the City of London was the stronghold of the Presbyterian ministers, and the city merchants their chief supporters. Their descendants are no longer Nonconformists. They have long ago been re-absorbed into the National Church. Many of

the bishops of the last century, as Butler, Secker, and Barrington, were the children of Presbyterians. Even in our own day the successor of the great Puritan leader, Lord Saye and Sele, is a dignitary of the Church. Those who have not conformed are found chiefly among the Unitarians. It was only the other day that the last of the descendants of Edmund Calamy died at Exeter, a member of the Unitarian or Presbyterian Church. The Presbyterians, apparently, had every element necessary to the constitution of a lasting ecclesiastical body. They had numbers, wealth, piety, learning, an honourable history, and yet they went to decay. The sect narrowed as its theology widened. We cannot enter upon reasons, but the simple facts are that the tone of the Established Church and of the Presbyterians became one. Their original principles may have stood distinctly over against each other, but their spirit had assimilated, and conformity thus became easy to the Nonconformist. As Presbyterianism passed into Unitarianism, those of the Presbyterians who clung to the faith of the Trinity found a refuge in the Established Church; while one or two ministers of the Church of England, who had lost faith in the Trinity, united with the remnant to form the community of Unitarians.

The Independents are the most numerous of the old Dissenters. The names of above two thousand ministers are registered in 'The Congregational Year-Book.' It is difficult to fix the date of the origin of Independency. If we are to credit some of its modern defenders, it began with Adam, who was an

Independent before the creation of Eve. All religious parties seem to think that truth and antiquity must go together. In the seventeenth century the advocates of Episcopacy traced its origin to Adam presiding as a patriarch over his descendants. Milton recommended them to go higher, and begin with Lucifer. Dr. Waddington, who has earned some reputation as the historian of Independency, traces it all through the dark ages up to the Fathers and Apostles. Its first appearance in England was in the person of Robert Brown, a clergyman of the Church of England, whose character, as history records it, is only indifferent. It was taken up by Henry Barrowe, John Penry, and some others who had been Presbyterians. It differed from Presbyterianism in this, that it unchurched the Established Church, denying it to be a Church. Its adherents were called the 'Brethren of the Separation,' because they separated themselves from the national worship and formed distinct congregations, consisting, as they said, of nothing but elect or believing souls. These old Independents were driven out of England in the time of James I. They fled to Holland, and finally to America. The next appearance of Independency was in the Westminster Assembly, when the 'five Dissenting Brethren' opposed the Directory for Worship and Church Government. Under Cromwell they displaced the Presbyterians. In 1657, Independency was about to be declared the national religion, but Cromwell died, and the Savoy Declaration never became law. The Independents had nearly the same fate as the old Presbyterians. They made little or no progress

till the beginning of this century. The present Independents can scarcely be reckoned the descendants of those of the seventeenth century. In the 'Congregational Year-Book' for 1870 there are 222 churches registered under London and its suburbs. Of these only 20 had their origin between 1700 and 1790. According to a MS. in Dr. Williams's library, in London within the 'Bills of Mortality,' in 1715 there were 29 Presbyterian Churches, 21 Independent, and 25 Baptist. In 1773 the Presbyterians were 19, the Baptists 12, and the Independents still 21.

The Baptists, differing from the Independents solely on the question of infant baptism, may also trace their origin to the beginning of the seventeenth century. It was not, however, till the time of the Commonwealth that they were cognizable as a distinct sect. Even to this day there are congregations partly Independents and partly Baptists. There are also two kinds of Baptists, differing in doctrine, one following Calvin and the other Arminius. This difference began in Holland at the very beginning of the Baptist sect. The Independents originally were rigid Calvinists, but Arminianism and other doctrines have found an entrance among them. The Baptists are in numbers about half the Independents. The Particular Baptists have 875 ministers, and the General or Arminian 123.

The great family of Wesleyans, originating in the last century, have nothing in common with the other Dissenters, unless it be that they are in the same company as outsiders of the Church. They refuse indeed to be called Dissenters, for though not Con-

formists, it is not from any objections to the doctrines or ceremonies of the Church of England, but solely that circumstances which they could not control have placed them where they are. In numbers, including all kinds of Wesleyans, they constitute one-half of the Nonconformists. They are not as a body hostile to the Church of England, and those who look into the future are not without hopes that the bonds between them and the Church of England may yet be drawn closer. The old Connexion has 2,280 preachers; the New Connexion 140; the Free Church 250; and the Primitive Methodists 780. It would throw some light on the past history of the Church of England could we get at the facts that would account for the distribution of different kinds of Dissenters in different parts of the country. The Independents are numerous in London and Lancashire, the Baptists in the Eastern counties, while in Lincolnshire, Staffordshire, and Cornwall Wesleyanism is almost the national religion.

Our estimate of the intelligence and religious worth of these bodies, and how far they are likely to rival the Established Church or to supplement it, must be made chiefly from those who are employed among them as preachers. Of the two thousand Independent ministers an appreciable number have taken degrees at a Scotch University or at the University of London. A few have studied in Germany. A considerable number have had no regular training; but the majority have been educated at one or other of the ten or twelve Independent Colleges or Academies, which by a curiously uneconomical division of labour

are scattered over the country. Taking at random a page of ministers in the 'Year-Book,' we find that two studied at Glasgow, two at Edinburgh, five had not any regular education, and the rest, forty-seven in number, are from the theological seminaries. The Unitarian ministers are understood to have a higher education than the Independents. It appears, however, from the 'Unitarian Almanack,' that the Scotch and German Universities contribute much the same proportion as among the Independents. The number without regular training is proportionably equal, while the majority are from the colleges of the denomination. The Baptists are below the average standard of the Independents. Many of their ministers are engaged in business, and the number of those who have no education with a view to the ministry is much larger than among the Independents. This, however, is a test of but limited application, for some of the ablest men in all denominations have been without a regular education. When any man affects to despise 'literate' in the Church of England, we have only to mention the names of Richard Baxter, Bishop Warburton, John Newton, and Edward Bickersteth. In some of the sketches of Mr. Spurgeon's life it is said that this great preacher was educated at an 'agricultural' College. From his case it is evident that wisdom may be learned even among them 'that hold the plough,' and 'whose talk is of bullocks.' The Wesleyans were long opposed to giving their ministers any special training. When they built a Theological College thirty years ago, it was the occasion of a schism in the body. It is now

necessary for every minister to spend three years at one of their denominational Colleges before he can be admitted on the itinerancy. The number of men with Scotch diplomas is much smaller among the Wesleyans than among the Independents. This may be accounted for by the steps of the probation which the Connexion prescribes, and partly perhaps by the paucity of Wesleyans in Scotland. At the present time the Conference receives about eighty candidates for the ministry annually. Of these, by an estimate recently made, about twenty are the sons of ministers who have had a good education at the Kingswood or Woodhouse Grove Schools, which were established for the education of the sons of preachers. About ten are the sons of middle-class tradesmen, who have been educated at the Wesleyan Collegiate Schools, established at Taunton and Sheffield. The remaining fifty are men who have previously followed some business, trade, or profession. All these bodies do not seem to have among their 6,500 preachers half-a-dozen of men educated either at Oxford or Cambridge. There is one in the Unitarian list, one in the Independent, and one or two among the Baptists and Wesleyans. It is a fact worth examining that a clergyman of the Church of England rarely becomes a preacher in a Dissenting body. If he leaves the Church he starts for himself, or, what is most frequently the case, joins some anti-clerical sect, such as the Society of Plymouth Brethren.

The first obvious difference between the Church clergyman and the Dissenting minister is, that, as a rule, they come from two different classes of society.

Admitting this to be true, which, indeed, it would be idle to dispute, it argues an imperfection, both in the Church and in the Dissenting bodies, that they do not draw their ministers from every class. A Christian Church should be a republic, a leveller of class and caste distinctions, a true 'City of God,' in which there is

'No high, no low, no great, no small.'

The minister of religion should be below no one, and above no one, but capable of all conditions with all men. It is among the humbler classes that the Dissenters have done their work; and just in proportion as Dissenters grow rich and adopt the customs of the higher classes, they conform to the Church of England. This is a great grief to the thorough anti-Church Dissenter. He erects on it an argument against the connection of Church and State, and exclaims against what he calls his 'unrighteous exclusion' from the two great Universities. We are not disposed to regard this as more than an imaginary grievance. There is no good reason why he should ever have been excluded from the Universities. The tests which excluded him were meant chiefly to exclude the Roman Catholic. It was no great hardship to an orthodox Dissenter to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion. The old Nonconformists always urged these Articles as the basis of a comprehension within the Establishment. Moreover, if the Dissenters had not a clear course at Oxford and Cambridge, they have had the London University for now thirty years, with all the Universities of Scotland and Germany open to them; or, what would

have been better for them than all these, they might have collected the scattered forces of their denominational colleges into a great university, into which they might have imported any amount of learning and civilisation that they wished.

But for some years the English Universities have been open to them with some restrictions, and before long even these restrictions will probably be removed. It has, however, been found as a fact that not many Dissenters have matriculated at the Universities, and those that did have generally become Churchmen before they left. The opening of the Universities has not added any university men to the Dissenting ministry. This is a fact which has some meaning, and it is an anxious question for the Dissenter what the future will do. This subject was well discussed by Mr. Neville Goodman in an interesting paper on 'The Universities and our Ministers,' read last year before the 'Autumnal Assembly of the Congregational Union.' Mr. Goodman does not reckon the advantages of an Oxford or Cambridge education as much exceeding those of the London University. He reduces them to these three:—

'(1.) A stimulus to high attainments, such as is generated by the association, and from the very atmosphere of these ancient seats of learning. (2.) A definiteness of thought and a precision of language, which is ever the mark of a scholar, and more especially of the gregarious scholar. (3.) Last and not least, a certain social status, which is of some practical value.'

Over against these he places as disadvantages—'(1) expense; (2) the absorbing nature of the pursuits; and (3) the danger of defection.' The last is a lesson

from past experience. It is accompanied with the hope that, though 'the storming party' has been defeated, yet, when the whole army goes up, the victory may be gained. Various schemes, such as erecting Nonconformist Colleges in Oxford and Cambridge, have been proposed to segregate the Dissenters from other students. All these Mr. Goodman condemns, as defeating the very object to be obtained, which is to let Dissenters breathe the free atmosphere of university life. The second disadvantage would withdraw the students from theological study, or involve the necessity of studying theology after the university course was finished. But the matter of expense is the most serious of all. Men who are able to send their sons to Oxford and Cambridge never intend them to be Dissenting ministers. They are not of that class in society which furnishes candidates for the Nonconformist ministry. Mr. Goodman's words are: 'Many, perhaps most, of our students are eleemosynary; and I cannot conceive that the community of subscribers will continue to furnish large funds for the benefit of those over whom they have no supervision, either directly or indirectly.' The expense of the Universities excludes the Dissenter more certainly than the tests. But it also excludes large numbers of the candidates for orders in the Church of England, so that the Church, as well as the Dissenters, is losing the benefit of what are properly her own schools of learning.

But beyond or beneath all these things there is another difficulty which is equally in the way of the Church of England and the Nonconformist communi-

ties, and which seems to baffle them all. That is, how to secure for the ministry men with a sufficient education, and, at the same time, the other qualifications necessary for this office. The great distinction between the clergyman and the Dissenting minister is not, after all, the difference of the classes in society from which they come, but of the mode of their being received as teachers of religion. The Church minister has simply to pass the prescribed course at the University, and if the bishop is satisfied with his testimonials, he is ordained without any reference even to his capacity to read or speak in public. The Dissenting minister, on the other hand, must have given evidence of some special qualification for ministerial work before he is sent to college. The one is trained from his youth with a view to the ministry; the other has passed his youth before his career in life has been decided on, and when it is too late to receive a thorough education. Each mode has its advantages and its disadvantages. The Church system secures regularly educated men; the other plan secures men of good natural gifts, whose way into the service of the Church is not so easy as into the ministry among the Dissenters. It is to be added, that often the work to be done among the humbler classes requires men who originally belonged to them. This would seem to point out the necessity, in a really National Church, of divers kinds of men in the ministry; and if this diversity cannot be obtained in one community, the necessity of Dissent is inevitable until a nearer realisation of our ideal of a Church.

The war-cry of the Dissenter at the present hour is

‘Religious Equality.’ He supposes that the State does not deal fairly with him while he has to contend with a richly endowed and highly privileged National Church. That he is under many disadvantages is not to be denied. But they are such as Dissenters might overcome without the disestablishment of the Church of England. It is a complaint which we frequently hear from the Dissenting minister, that in social standing the most insignificant curate is preferred before him. The curate is the recognised or legal teacher. The Dissenting minister feels that he is not. Something of this may be imaginary. A multitude of these grievances would be easily remedied by that Christian spirit which seeks the lowest room. But the clergyman sometimes claims the uppermost seat, on the ground that the Dissenter is an unauthorized teacher. There is a general complaint that the clergy do not regard the Dissenting ministers as their equals. This in the main is true; but it is very doubtful if the separation of Church and State would in any way alter it. The clerical haughtiness towards the Dissenting teacher has various grounds. Frequently it is the mere pride of a man who has studied at an English University towards one who has not. The English Universities nurture the belief that wisdom was born and will die with them. The same contempt which some clergymen show for Dissenting ministers they show also for their own brethren if they have not graduated at Oxford or Cambridge. This feeling, it is true, is most highly developed in the inferior class of university men, who have learned little more by their education at a university than the pride of having

been there. When this is the cause of the Church minister despising the Dissenting teacher, it is evident that the separation of Church and State would not change the matter. In Scotland, where Episcopacy lives on thorns and thistles, the Episcopalian minister keeps himself at a greater distance from the Presbyterian than the parish clergyman in England from the Nonconformist. The ministers of the Church of Scotland have ever been willing to treat their prelatial brethren as even more than equals. They have offered them every service, even to the use of their churches; but the minister of Episcopacy, though in aristocratic poverty, has never forgotten that he was the true channel of the grace apostolical. This was the doctrine of the old Independent, when he set up his 'gathered Church;' of the old Baptist, who excluded all from the kingdom of God who had not been wholly immersed in the waters of baptism. It is the doctrine of some modern Dissenters, as well as of the disciples of Dr. Pusey, and must be remedied by some other prescription than the separation of Church and State. Our real difficulty with the social position of the Dissenting minister is to know what constitutes a Dissenting minister. In Scotland the difficulty vanishes, from the fact that all ministers have gone through nearly the same studies, and there is, in consequence, some approach to a natural equality. But in England a Dissenting minister may be anything, from the profoundest scholar to the most ignorant mechanic. If Dissenters, instead of trying to bring down the Church to their level, would raise themselves to the level of the Church, religious inequalities, excepting

those which are inevitable, would naturally disappear. If the Dissenters continue, as they have begun, to erect buildings that equal and sometimes surpass those of the Established Church, and to fill them with efficient ministers, the Church of England will have more cause to fear losing its power over the upper classes than by the separation of Church and State.

The future of the Church of England, yea, the future of the Christianity of England, depends on the relations that are to exist between the Church and the civil Government. Disestablishment in the sense in which the Irish Church has been disestablished, would put the Nonconformist in a worse position than he is in now, if the Church without the State could continue as one body. It would be a vast combination, with vast property, not controlled by the State—a dangerous empire within the empire. One of the arguments which Dean Stanley urges for the endowment and establishment of Churches is to provide against the evils of ecclesiastical government. The danger to the State is certainly greater from a Church which is connected with a foreign power than from one limited to the English realm. Yet a check is necessary, if only to prevent the undue accumulation of property. It is at this point that Church and State inevitably touch each other. Church property is called specifically national property. It is on this ground that the Dissenter asks disestablishment and disendowment. But this is founded on a simple obliviousness of what is meant by national property. The endowments of the Church of England are not 'private' endowments, simply because it is the State

Church. They cannot be used as the Church directs, but as the State directs. Mr. Hobhouse has clearly explained the difference between 'private' endowments and those given to the State Church. In the latter the State can always interfere to determine how they are to be used. In the former the will of the donor continues through all time. Hence the enormous evils of the 'charitable' or 'private' foundations in England. Trustees are bound by the wills of men who lived centuries ago, who had no knowledge of the necessities of our times, and whose property has increased to what it is by the labour and industry of subsequent generations. The amount of property in England bound up by the wills of men long since dead, Mr. Hobhouse estimates at £3,000,000 annually; and the effect of it, in his judgment, is evil rather than good. Church property is reckoned worth £6,000,000 annually, but with all the imperfections of its administration we have something to show for it, in 14,000 churches, with their weekly services and a well-educated body of clergy. The property of the Church is national property, simply because the State has taken possession of it. It did not proceed from the State. The Church's property before the Reformation was accumulated in a great measure out of bequests voluntarily made to the clergy. There have been at different times direct endowments from the State, but what the State gave to the Church has been as nothing compared with what it took away. Even since the Reformation the wealth of the Church of England has been vastly increased by voluntary endowments. But all these, equally with the oldest

possessions of the Church, are national property. 'At every crisis of change in this country,' says Mr. Hobhouse, 'the principle that Church endowments are national property has been asserted in unmistakable terms.' 'The State,' says Sir John Coleridge, 'has always asserted its right to control and claim ecclesiastical property, and has, with undeviating and inflexible pertinacity, consistently given notice, by statute of mortmain, to all its subjects, that if men give property by will to the Church, it is given to the State, liable to State control and legislation.' Mr. Hobhouse wishes that the endowments of private foundations be also made national property. But what does that mean? Simply that the State would take these abused charities and apply them to some useful object, irrespective of the will of the donors. This tacitly supposes that they are already State property. The difference is that the State has long ago felt the necessity of controlling Church property, while it is only to-day that the necessity emerges for dealing with the property of the old 'charities.' The plain inference is that all property belongs to the State in conjunction with those who hold it, and when any property within a commonwealth is not used for the good of the commonwealth, the civil power may interfere and determine how it is to be used. The Church of England disestablished, with its present wealth, or, as in the case of the Irish Church, with two-thirds of it, would be a greater hindrance to the Nonconformist and a greater evil in his eyes, than it is now under the control of the State.

But it is certain that the disestablished Church of

England would not keep together as one Church. The State acts towards it, to use Richard Baxter's words, as 'a unifying head.' One element in the State Church question, not to be overlooked, is contributed by the fact that such a Church as the Church of Rome exists. It is near us as a dangerous and subtle enemy. There is no reason why, in a free country, the Roman Catholic, simply as a citizen, should not have the same freedom as the representative of any other religion. But the past history and the avowed principles of his Church both bear testimony that it claims supremacy over nations incompatible with that freedom and equality which we would give to all Churches. There are times in a nation's history when the benefit of a State Church has been felt by all. Such times have been, and while the Church of Rome exists may be again. But; on other grounds, it is not desirable that the parties now included in the National Church should be divided into new sects. If the kingdom of God were some external organization, and the doctrines of Christianity so fully understood that further progress would be impossible, then we might act on the principle of every man excommunicating every other man who did not believe as he did. But since God has not given the Church any material or outward frame, and since we have yet much to learn ere we reach Christian perfection, we should not willingly dispense with the covering, earthly tabernacle though it be, which the State has thrown over us, and which keeps us together as the Christians of a Protestant nation.

To return briefly to the question of subscription. When Sir John Coleridge read his paper at Sion

College, the Dean of Westminster remarked that the Solicitor-General seemed to overlook the modification as to subscription which had been made during the last few years. A clergyman is not now pledged to every statement of the Church's formularies. He only declares his general assent to the doctrines of the Church. This doubtless leaves an open door for dishonest men, but experience teaches that no door, however close, can keep them out. The tests having been found ineffectual, Dean Stanley is in favour of getting rid of them altogether. Before such a step is taken, many even of the most liberal Churchmen will pause. Tests are of two kinds. They may be barriers in the way of progress, or they may be badges of victory in the hard battles of the past. The Church of England has a history, in many respects a noble history. No true Englishman wishes the memory of the struggles of the Reformation to be forgotten. The negative part of a creed is sometimes as important as the positive. The errors of the Church of Rome were renounced at the Reformation by the people of England. The National Church set up the Articles and formularies to prevent the return of these errors. If we pull down the barriers that are behind us, our progress onward may be arrested. If we were in no danger of a return of Roman Catholic heresies, it would be right at once to set aside the formularies which condemn them. Like other old errors in theology, they might be left to the pages of the historian. But the Church of Rome still exists. It is as exacting, as audacious, and as unscrupulous as ever in proclaiming, with the pre-

tence of infallibility, dogmas opposed to the catholic reason of mankind, and the plain sense of the canonical writings. The gulf between us and the Church of Rome is impassable while that Church continues what it is. Tests that secure the territory already gained must not be rashly laid aside.

It is admitted on all hands that the Thirty-nine Articles are not perfect. The eighteenth and the thirteenth seem to deny the possibility of salvation to the virtuous heathen, or that good works can be done by any but Christians. The ninth gives a description of the original wickedness of man at variance with the facts of human life. The fourth speaks of Christ as in heaven, with a body consisting of 'flesh' and 'bones,' while a better authority tells us that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven. The sixth article gives a list of canonical books 'of whose authority never was any doubt in the Church,' and yet among the 'commonly received' are several which, at different times, have been the cause of great doubt and controversy. These are imperfections which strike us who live three hundred years after the Articles were written, far removed from the strifes which engaged the minds of those who wrote them: so that more than a general consent could not now be required of any man. Yet even with these imperfections, every one of these articles contains a protest against dangerous errors. The sixth article is intended to exclude the apocryphal books from the canon. The thirteenth is aimed at the substitution of ceremonial works for those of the moral law. The ninth, with some that follow, is meant to teach us the necessity

of Divine help in the spiritual life; and even the fourth, gross and objectionable as the statement is, has a very valuable meaning when we connect it with the desire which the Reformers had to express their entire opposition to the doctrine of the objective presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist. Better far would it be to bear with the imperfection of the Articles, than to risk losing such express renunciations of the heresies of the Church of Rome.

Sir John Coleridge did not argue his subject from the High Church side. He did not advocate the abolition of subscription for the sake of the consciences of those who ride over the Articles in the fashion of Tract XC. or of Dr. Pusey's 'Eirenicon.' His arguments all come from evident sympathy with the difficulties of the Broad Churchmen. The occasion, or, if we may so speak, the *casus belli*, of the paper, was Mr. Clark's letter to the Bishop of Ely. In that letter Mr. Clark stated that he could no longer express his conscientious belief in all the 'canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament,' inasmuch as 'some portions of the Scriptures now seem to him to be of doubtful genuineness, and others to contain erroneous statements in history, and questionable teaching in theology and morals.' The Dean of Westminster expressed his regret that a man of the high character and great learning of the Bishop of Ely did not answer Mr. Clark's letter, and assure him that the very same sentiments were entertained by himself and every clergyman in the country. The Dean's statement rather surprised the audience. It was repudiated by some clergymen, who regarded the

Public Orator's letter as putting him, not merely beyond the pale of the Church of England, but of Christianity. The full extent of Mr. Clark's meaning may yet be open to doubt. He put his case strongly, as if he intended a manifesto. Some explanation is required of the sentence, 'questionable teaching in theology and morals.' As to erroneous 'statements in history and doubtful genuineness' of certain books, these are open questions for further study. If Mr. Clark does not mean more than his words may fairly be understood to mean, he has said nothing to bring him in collision with the formularies of the Church in the modified form of subscription. The Bishop of Ely might have shown him that he was only beating against the shadow of a wall which already had been battered down.

Since the greater part of this paper was written we have received Mr. Clark's calm, earnest, and temperate pamphlet. We have admitted that subscription to creeds has its difficulties, but we think that Mr. Clark fails to recognise the inevitable conditions of progress. If our religious knowledge is progressive there must be always of necessity an infinite variety of religious opinions. Are men to divide themselves into distinct sects or churches because of every little difference that may arise? Or are they not rather to remain as long as possible in one church with a general agreement on some common principles? Mr. Clark wishes to resign his orders because he believes the Bible is not infallible, and because he thinks the Church of England requires him to believe that it is. He admits that there is no article, no positive statement in any formulary of the

Church, which declares the infallibility of the Scriptures. His plea is that this infallibility is everywhere assumed. He refuses to measure what he considers the moral obligation by the legal one. In our judgment subscription could be no hardship to Mr. Clark so long as he believes that the Scriptures really contain a revelation from God. No law, either divine or human, binds his conscience to any infallibility but this.

As to patronage and the present saleable condition of Church property, it is impossible that it can continue much longer in the face of the searching inquiry which must soon be made into the condition of all our national institutions. If it cannot be stopped, disestablishment is sure to be the other alternative, and disendowment with a far less dowry than was given to the Irish Church. The root of the evil is not the illegal transfer of livings, but the legalised mode of selling advowsons and next presentations. It would be better for the Church either that no sale was legal, or that no sale was illegal. The restrictions only place difficulties in the way of conscientious men. Let it all be legal, and then men will know what they ought to do. Or, better still, let it all be illegal. Let the patronage of all livings be vested, as far as possible, in the parishioners, and laws laid down by which they are to be governed in their choice. The Church of England wants nothing more than to be cast on the people. When the Archbishop of Canterbury said lately that the laity were represented in the Church by having so much patronage in their hands, he seemed to us 'as one that mocked.' Patronage, in

the hands of men who buy and sell, is a strange interest for the laity to have in the Church, as well as a strange mode of dealing with national property. Instead of doing for the people, we must give the people the opportunity of doing for themselves, and when a new church is needed, there will be no necessity for one or two thousand pounds from some clergyman to help to finish it, that he may have, in return, the first presentation and all the rights and privileges which are conferred by the present connection with the State.

As to the Churches outside the Church of England, let us look at things as they are, and no longer deal in theories. The day for schemes of comprehension, and everything of that kind, is apparently past. But there is nothing to prevent the most friendly relations and the freest intercourse amongst all Christians. It has already been recommended in this *Review*, by the Dean of Canterbury,* that Dissenting ministers be allowed occasionally to preach in our churches. The Dean of Westminster has shown that there is nothing to prevent this even under the Act of Uniformity, on condition of subscribing to part of the Thirty-nine Articles. Those who could make the modified subscription now required under the recent Subscription Act, might do this without any alteration of the law. And while the Nonconformist may preach in the Church of England, there is apparently even less in the way of the Conformist preaching for the Dissenter. Few things would tend more to remove the differences and social jealousies that now exist between the

* Dean Alford.

Churchman and the Nonconformist than this mutual interchange of their ministerial services. We boast of our freedom in the Church of England, yet some courage is required in an English clergyman to preach even in the pulpits of the Presbyterian State Church of Scotland.*

The moral of this paper, if it must be mentioned in a sentence at the end, is, that the Church of England, as it now stands, is a great national institution in the hands of the nation; therefore let it be used for the good of the nation.

* Since this was written a bishop and an archbishop have preached in the kirk. The event caused some commotion among the Episcopalians in Scotland and some parties in England, but no law of either Church or State was broken. We have no wish to repudiate the Episcopalians in Scotland any more than any other sect, but it is not reasonable that their fancies should be any hindrance to our liberty.

II.

NATURE-DEVELOPMENT AND THEOLOGY.*

TWO methods of contemplating Nature seem to have existed since the first dawnings of human thought. It would be difficult to say which was the earlier; for, though apparently irreconcilable with each other, they seem to have been contemporaneous. A German philosopher once said that every man was born either a Platonist or an Aristotelian. Certain ways of thinking belong to certain classes of men, and methods of philosophy take their character from that of the minds which originate them.

The study of Nature was doubtless the first study that engaged the human mind. The earliest religions, theologies, and mythologies of all nations have been connected with systems of Nature. The most probable interpretation of Pagan worship is that which

* Contemporary Review, May, 1870.

On the Physical Basis of Life. By Professor HUXLEY. 'Fortnightly Review,' Feb., 1869. Chapman and Hall.

As Regards Protoplasm in Relation to Professor Huxley's Essay. By JAMES H. STIRLING, LL.D. Blackwood and Sons. 1869.

The Reign of Law. By the DUKE OF ARGYLL. Fifth Edition. Strahan & Co. 1870.

Essays, Philosophical and Theological. By JAMES MARTINEAU. Trübner & Co. 1866.

Das Christenthum und die moderne Naturwissenschaft. Von J. FROHSCHAMMER. Williams and Norgate. 1868.

resolves it into the worship of Nature, making the heathen gods and goddesses personifications of the invisible forces that pervade the universe. The oldest theologians identify God and Nature. The old Brahman said that Brahm protruded the universe from himself, as the tortoise protrudes his limbs, or as the spider weaves a web from its own bowels. Hermes Trismegistus, the interpreter of the Egyptian theology, called all created things parts and members of God. Bunsen, describing the religion of the early Egyptians, says—

‘ God dwelt
In the piled mountain rock, the veinéd plant,
And pulsing brute, and where the planets wheel
Through the blue skies, Godhead moved in them.’

The fundamental idea of these religions was Development. The divine substance was evolved into the being of the universe, so that all natures or substances were in their original one nature or substance. This is probably the best key to the meaning of the old Greek philosophers. Their object was to find the first or primordial essence. Thales said it was ‘water;’ Anaximander called it the ‘boundless,’ because, being all, it could not be any one of the things that are finite; Anaximenes called it ‘air;’ Pythagoras called it the ‘one;’ Heraclitus ‘fire,’ or the ‘eternal strife;’ and Parmenides ‘being.’ Aristotle says, ‘Our ancestors and men of great antiquity have left us a tradition, involved in fable, that these first essences are gods, and that the Divinity comprehends the whole of Nature.’

The other method of contemplating Nature regards it as a work distinct from its Author. It

cannot be said that this idea was unknown even to the earliest teachers of Development. The Hindu Brahm, that evolved Nature from his own being, was also Creator, Preserver, and Destroyer. He created, formed, or moulded Nature according to his will. This implied in the Deity a personality which the idea of evolution seemed to deny. The doctrine of a forming and designing mind working in Nature is supposed by some to have been held by Thales and the other Greek philosophers, who made the primal element the chief object of their search. But when Anaxagoras appeared, teaching that 'the Divine Mind was the cause of all things, and had arranged them in their proper ranks and classes,' Aristotle said that, compared with the other Ionics, he was like 'a sober man.' Socrates, however, who had deeper religious feelings, was not satisfied with the doctrine of Anaxagoras. It was not enough that the Divine Being should construct the universe, and then leave it, like a self-acting machine, to its own laws. Socrates could not conceive of the Deity ceasing from His work, and retiring into undisturbed repose. The God of Socrates sits on no silent throne. He works unceasingly. In the words of Goethe, Nature never lacks His presence:—

'So dass was in Ihm lebt und webt und ist
Nie Seine Kraft, nie Seinen Geist vermisst.'

Or in the words of our own poet Cowper:—

'There lives and works
A soul in all things, and that soul is God.'

Plato, in his philosophy, combined the 'Being' of Parmenides with the 'Mind' of Anaxagoras. He

reconciled the two theologies which have generally been thought irreconcilable. 'The Being' was also 'the Artificer of the Universe.' 'When God,' Plato says, 'had formed the soul of the world, the soul shot itself into the midst of the universe to the extremities of being. Spreading itself everywhere, and reacting upon itself, it formed at all times a divine origin of the eternal wisdom.' The Book of Genesis represents the Creator as working six days, and then resting from His creation. It is not said that He made created things of His own substance, nor even that all things are originally of one substance. 'God made the beast of the earth *after his kind*, and cattle *after their kind*, and every living thing that creepeth upon the earth *after his kind*.' The creating 'Mind' of Anaxagoras, which wrought once and then retired, gives the idea of God and His relation to Nature which most resembles that of the Book of Genesis. Whether the Biblical account is a popular conception, or a partial statement adapted to the ordinary understanding, or a full scientific account of creation, is not a question at present to be discussed. The same view of creation is frequently found in ancient authors. Lucretius gives all things a distinct nature of their own—

'Res quæque suo ritu procedit et omnes
Fœdere naturæ certo discrimina servant.'

The account of creation with which Ovid begins his *Metamorphoses* resembles that in Genesis:—

'Ante mare et terras, et quod tegit omnia cœlum
Unus erat toto naturæ vultus in orbe.'

Bayle translates this passage as meaning that before there was a heaven, an earth, and a sea, nature was

all 'homogeneous.' This interpretation has been disputed, as Ovid says, immediately after—

'Mollia cum duris sine pondere habentia pondus.'

But there is not any real contradiction. The original chaos consisted of a primary matter, in which things afterwards 'soft' and 'hard,' 'light' and 'heavy,' were blended together. The creating Deity, *Quisquis fuit ille deorum*, formed all things out of this first matter, and gave them the qualities which they now have. This is clearly the Mosaic doctrine of creation. But in Horace we have the development of men from 'a dumb and filthy herd' of animals, who at first fought for acorns with their nails and fists; afterwards they forged arms, then they learned to speak, and at last built cities and established governments.

'Mutum et turpe pecus glandem atque cubilia propter
Unguibus et pugnibus, dein fustibus,' &c.

The revival of the doctrine of development in Nature is contemporaneous with the science of geology. That science, even in its first essays, can scarcely be dated earlier than the second half of the last century. It is true that almost three hundred years ago Bernard Palissy pronounced a mine of marl to be a mass of shells deposited by the sea. But even in the last century the marine character of the shells, and the theories founded on their discovery, were ridiculed by the wise men of Europe. Voltaire said he would sooner believe that 'Edith, the wife of Lot, was changed into a statue of salt,' than that the ocean once deposited shells in the vicinity of Chablais and Ripaille, or on the top of Mont Cenis. It was more

likely that pilgrims to Rome had carried them in their bonnets !

But incipient geologists, from the discovery of the shells so far from the sea, believed that the sea must once have covered the whole earth. There were many things that seemed to confirm this belief. The ancient Egyptians had deified the Nile. Out of water came that abundant fertility which made the riches and the strength of Egypt. Homer and Hesiod had traced the origin of all things to Oceanus and Tethys. Thales supposed water the first element of Nature, and the Book of Genesis says that the Spirit of God brooded over the face of the deep. The marine origin of the world, and all that is therein, was set forth by De Maillet, one of the early students of what is now the science of geology. He found, or at least thought he found, the bones of men, animals, and reptiles, with oyster and coral shells, all mingled together, and petrified into hard rock. He could only account for their being there by the action of the sea when the masses were soft and liquid. He said that petrified ships had been dug up on the tops of the Alps and the Apennines, and that keels, anchors, and masts had been found among the sands of Libya. On a Swiss mountain there had been discovered the petrified bodies of sixty mariners, who had been shipwrecked in a storm before the beginning of the Egyptian chronology. But unnumbered ages previous to that era the ocean embraced the seeds of all things in one mass of homogeneous protoplasm.

Before man had come to the perfection of his being, it was necessary to suppose that he had existed as a

simpler organism than he now is. He may have been a mollusc, a star-fish, a flat-fish, a turbot, or a cod. The fins may have lengthened into arms, the forked tails into legs, and so the fish became a man. He was at first, of course, a *sea-man*; for till the gills had been changed into lungs he could not live out of his native element. It was easy for the unbelieving Voltaire to laugh at this doctrine. He could no more believe it than he could believe in petrified sea-shells or basalted 'Edith, Lot's wife.' 'Notwithstanding,' he says, 'the extreme passion for genealogies which now prevails, there are few people who would believe that they descended from a turbot or a cod-fish. To establish this system, all species and elements must absolutely have changed into one another, and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* would become the best book of physics ever written.'

But 'the unlearned man laughs at the philosopher.' De Maillet saw a unity of type in Nature. He found correspondences between different organisms. Nature was a ladder of which he did not see all the steps; but he saw some. It was a chain of which he had found some links; but he could not put them together. His first effort was to co-ordinate the forms of life on dry land and those in the sea. The ocean still bears witness to its universal fatherhood. We have sea-roses, sea-lilies, sea-violets, and sea-vines. When the water receded from the land plants and flowers remained. What changes they have since undergone are due to the influences of the sun and fresh water, being nourished by the rains and rivulets that water the earth. Similar conformations are visible in ani-

mals. Varieties of plumage and form in birds have their analogies in the shape, colour, and disposition of the scales of fishes. The fins of a fish are arranged like the feathers in its analogous bird. If we attend to the flight of birds we shall discover a likeness to the mode in which the corresponding fishes swim in the water. The same analogies De Maillet finds between land animals and sea animals. When the waters left the land the marine animals had no alternative but to become land animals; and should the ocean again overflow the world, what could they do but again betake themselves to the sea? In the struggle for life many would, doubtless, perish; but some would eat the herb of Glaucus, and when used to the new element, would find a congenial home with their ancient marine relatives, the children of Nereus and Doris. De Maillet wanted but one link to connect the marine half of creation with that on dry land. This link was a *sea-man*. There were *mer*-maids, doubtless; but the *mer*-men were not so plentiful. Such beings, however, had been seen. There was one caught in Holland, one at Exeter, and one in the twelfth century on the coast of Suffolk. The last gentleman was taken to Cambridge; but one day, when walking in St. Peter's quadrangle, he eluded his keeper, plunged into the Cam, and never again appeared. In the last century about sixty of these *sea-men* surrounded an English whaler near Greenland. Each of them rowed a little boat. When they saw the sailors in the ship they went under the sea, boats and all, except one poor fellow who broke his oar. He was caught, but died soon after. His boat and fishing tackle were

curiously made of fish bones. They were brought to England, and, for the information of the curious, De Maillet says that they may yet be seen in the Town Hall of Hull.

In the second half of the last century the doctrine of development was taken up by Jean Baptiste Robinet, author of a once famous work called 'De la Nature.' Nature with Robinet was not God, but it was necessarily and eternally evolved from the Divine essence. 'In the beginning,' in Genesis, means out of time and in eternity. Creation is the everlasting work of the Deity, who from eternity has been working in and after the manner of Nature. The law which chiefly prevails in Nature is progression. There are no leaps. All things begin to exist under the smallest possible forms. Nature in itself knows nothing of kingdoms, classes, or species. These are artificial, the work of man. All things must have come from a unity, which has been infinitely diversified. This was the prototype of all that exists. Nature has been ever aiming at higher and more complete organizations. This is illustrated by the architectural skill of man, which begins with a hut or wigwam, and rises to an *Escurial* or a *Louvre*. The *ourang* was next to man in the scale of being. All the links of Nature's chain may not yet have been discovered, but ere long, Robinet said, science must discover them.

Lamarek followed Robinet, adding nothing to the theory, but by natural studies bringing it more within the region of science. To him, as to Robinet, Nature had no immutable orders or species. Circumstances

and conditions were the cause of diversities and variations, even of those between vegetables and animals, insects and men. Nature is one. A seminal fluid pervades creation, and impregnates matter when placed in circumstances favourable to life. Nature begins with simple forms—'rough drafts'—infusoria and polypi. When life has once pressed in, it strives to increase the organism which it animates. This internal striving, or 'sentiment,' as Lamarck called it, was the physical cause of the possession of the different senses and organs of the body. The duck and the beaver, having long endeavoured to swim, webs at length grew on their feet; the antelope and gazelle became swift to run because often pursued by beasts of prey; the neck of the camelopard was elongated through stretching its head to the high branches of the trees on which it finds its food. In this way the 'mute and filthy race' mentioned by Horace, after long efforts to speak, became 'articulate-speaking men.'

The doctrine of development, even though sanctioned by the great name of Lamarck, was still a subject of ridicule. Men could not believe it. They grinned at the suggestion of such an ancestry as it ascribed to the human race. But its history in this century is the history of the science of Nature. Cuvier withstood it to the last; but his great contemporary and fellow-worker, Geoffroy St. Hilaire, only waited till Cuvier completed his classification of the animal kingdom, that from this very work he might draw arguments in support of development. Cuvier thought to find the natural classification, but confessed

that he could not find it. St. Hilaire doubted its existence. The lines which seem to separate between genera and species were to him as imaginary as the lines of latitude and longitude which divide the globe. When this subject was discussed by Cuvier and St. Hilaire before the French Academy in 1830, it is said to have engrossed the public mind even more than the impending revolution. The doctrine of development was made popular in England by the famous 'Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation.' It is supported by the long and patient labours of Mr. Darwin, and it now numbers among its converts the distinguished geologist, Sir Charles Lyell. The 'Vestiges' rejected Lamarck's doctrine of the 'internal sentiment,' making the phenomenon of reproduction the key to the genesis of species. Mr. Darwin accounts for the diversities in Nature called species by the principle of 'Natural Selection.'

The doctrine of development was at first a speculation about Nature. It originated in the speculative philosophy. It is in that region still, however much some of its advocates may exclaim against all philosophy not founded on observation and experience. The human mind has ever had intuitions of a unifying principle which made all one in the midst of diversity. The 'one in the many' was as familiar to the old Greek as it is to the modern German. The 'Nature producing' and the 'Nature produced' of Spinoza, the 'Deity in Himself' and in 'His other being' of Schelling, were theological ideas which, after uniting God and Nature, led to expectations of a continued unity in Nature itself. Experiment and observation

have provided facts which tend to confirm the hypothesis, but which do not prove it. A purely scientific man may say that he believes that it is the probable solution of Nature's secret, yet he must confess there is still something between the conclusion and the premises.

Mr. Huxley's paper is a discourse on the 'Physical Basis of Life.' He supposes that he has found the protoplasm, or first matter, out of which all things were made. He identifies it with a semi-fluid substance to be found lining the inner surface of the outer case of the hair of a stinging-nettle. He sees in all things a unity of faculty, of form, and of substance. The painter and the lichen he paints, the botanist and the flower which he classifies, Mr. Huxley and the animalcules under his microscope, are all composed of 'masses of protoplasm.' To the question—is there no difference between a 'plant' and an 'animal?' Mr. Huxley answers that 'plants and animals are not separable, and that in many cases it is a mere matter of convention whether we call a given organism an animal or a plant.' Mr. Stirling denies that Mr. Huxley has found *the* protoplasm. He quotes against him the most 'advanced' Germans, who find that the cells which are reckoned to contain protoplasm differ in their chemical ingredients. He denies that either 'Molecularists or Darwinians' are able 'to level out the difference between organic and inorganic, or between genera and genera, or species and species.'

We do not believe that Mr. Huxley has found the first matter of life. We do not believe that he ever will find it, and for this reason, that it is 'beyond all

the physical forces which man can test and try.' It is not to be seen, tested, or handled. It is outside of the grossness of matter. It will ever elude his grasp like the sunbeam through the window, or the phantasmagorian images on the canvas. He may find a stage in its progress from the invisible to the visible, which may seem to be a resting-place. Other physiologists will tell him to move on, and Mr. Huxley's 'semi-fluid' of the bark of the 'hair of the stinging-nettle' will find a place in the same category with the primordial water of Thales the Milesian, the 'eternal strife' of Heraclitus, or the homogeneous 'rudis indigestaque moles' of the Roman poet.

It is, however, possible—yea, probable—that such a basis of life does exist; that is to say, that all things are diversified formations from one homogeneous substance. Mr. Stirling thinks that Mr. Huxley has really not said anything remarkable in declaring that there is a protoplasm which is the matter of all organisms. For some time physiologists have traced the origin of all organization to primitive cells; even the popular mind has been used to the belief that man was made of dust. The objection to Mr. Huxley's doctrine is not that he has found a universal protoplasm; that may be left for discussion with other physiologists. But Mr. Huxley is supposed to erect on his physical discovery a doctrine of materialism, and to account for the existence of the universe without the necessity of a forming mind.

The Duke of Argyll calls inferences of this kind a great injustice to scientific men, and refers specially to Professor Huxley's article on 'Protoplasm,' and the

unwise criticism of some adverse reviewers. Mr. Huxley is often misunderstood, and we cannot deny that this misunderstanding is sometimes due to his own phraseology, and perhaps even more to a certain tone which suggests more than is said, and in our judgment more than is meant. But within his own sphere there is no man living more deserving the confidence of truth-loving men than Professor Huxley. He does his own work well. To use a homely phrase, he keeps his own door-step clean. If his opponents did the same they would better understand Mr. Huxley, and Mr. Huxley would better understand them.

Those of us who for the last ten years have been thinking over these questions, look back with a feeling of amazement to the difficulties, once formidable, that have now disappeared like mountains of mist before the light of the sun. In the Duke of Argyll's 'Reign of Law,' doctrines and positions once denounced as infidel and atheistic are used to support religion, and to confirm men's faith in the Divine government of the world. The question of development in nature should never have been a question of God or no God. The man of science and the theologian should alike have regarded it as simply a question of how the Divine Being works. The study of this is the study of the science of God, and may be the employment of created minds throughout the infinite ages. In the words of Wieland,—

'To think Him will be continually the highest striving of the deep thought
Of every inhabitant of heaven: they will strive for ever.'

'Ihn zu denken wird stets die höchste Bestrebung des Tiefsinns
Jedes Olympiers seyn, sie werden sich ewig bestreben.'

The Duke of Argyll says, 'Whatever may have been the method or process of creation, it is creation still. If it were proved to-morrow that the first man was "born" from some pre-existing form of life, it would still be true that such a birth must have been, in every sense of the word, a new creation.' Under the reign of law is defined as 'under an agency through which we see working everywhere some purpose of the Everlasting Will.' Again, the Duke of Argyll says, 'It is no mere theory, but a fact as certain as any other fact of science, that creation has had a history. It has not been a single act done and finished once for all, but a long series of acts—a work continuously pursued through an inconceivable lapse of time.'

The development hypothesis is grounded on some facts which must be acknowledged, whatever becomes of the hypothesis itself. The first of these is what we may call a geological progression. The extinct forms of life are found to be connected by an orderly gradation with those which now exist. Creation has proceeded from lower to higher types. The evidence of this progression is not perfect, that is to say, some of the links are wanting; but so many have been found as to render it certain that the others once existed. We quote again from the 'Reign of Law:': 'Very recently a discovery has been made, to which Mr. Darwin only a few years ago referred as a discovery of which the chance is very small, viz., of fossil organisms in beds far beneath the lowest Silurian strata. This discovery has been made in Canada, in beds far down, near the bottom even, of the rocks

hitherto termed Azoic. But what are the forms of life which have been found here? They belong to the very lowest of living types—to the “Rhizopods.” So far as the discovery goes, therefore, it is in strict accordance with all the facts previously known—that as we go back in time we lose, one after another, the higher and more complex organisms: first, the Mammalia; then the Vertebrata; and now, lastly, even the Mollusca.’

But before geology was a science, the unity of Nature had become evident to all students of the physical world. Even Cuvier admits analogies among the subdivisions of the four great classes into which he divided the animal kingdom. The Vertebrata shaded imperceptibly into the Mollusca, the Mollusca into the Articulata, and these again into the Radiata. St. Hilaire said that the divisions themselves were but arbitrary, for between each class there were intermediaries which completed the chain of being. Nor did it stop with animals: it passed into vegetables; and by the same continuity the organic passed into the inorganic. The disciples of Cuvier long withstood the doctrine of types; but they were at last compelled to yield. Professor Owen says that on reviewing the researches of anatomists into the special homologies of the cranial bones, he was surprised to find that they all agreed as to the existence of the determinable bones in the skull of every animal, down to the lowest osseous fish. One type serves for the arms of man, the wings of the bat, the forefeet of quadrupeds, and the paddles of the whale. Professor Huxley maintains that monkeys as well as men have the ‘posterior lobe’ of the brain

and the ‘hippocampus minor;’ that they are not four-handed, as naturalists commonly make them, but that they have two feet and two hands, the feet consisting, like a human foot, of an *os calcis*, and an astragalus, with the other tarsals and the usual metatarsals and phalanges. The ostrich does not fly, yet it has rudimentary wings. In some quadrupeds there is a membrane which covers the eye in sleep; corresponding to this, anatomists find a rudimentary membrane at the internal angle of the human eye. And not only are all animals formed on the same plan, but even the different parts of the same animals seem modifications of other parts. The osseous pouch of the allouat, the organ by means of which it makes its strange howl, is an enlargement of the hyoid bone; the purse of the female opossum is a deep fold of the skin; the trunk of the elephant is an excessive prolongation of the nostrils; and the horn of the rhinoceros a mass of adherent hairs. In some organisms the stomach is but a simple modification of the intestines. Every organ seems to have grown out of some other, by a modification or adaptation necessary for its present purpose. In the simpler forms of life different functions are performed by the same organs, but in the more complex forms special organs become appropriated to special functions. And even bones are formed after a type. Lorenz Oken saw the bleached skull of a deer in the Hartz forest, and he exclaimed, ‘It is a vertebral column!’ Anatomists are now agreed that Oken was right. The same structure that served for the backbone served also for the skull.

This unity of plan pervades too the vegetable crea-

tion. It is remarkable that the scientific doctrine of vegetable morphology was not due to botanists, but to the clear intuitions of a poet. 'It was,' says Principal Tulloch in his Burnet Prize Essay, 'to the fine and subtle glance of Goethe, roaming through nature, with so rich a perception of its harmonies, that typical forms of structure in the vegetable world first revealed themselves.' In the 'Metamorphoses of Plants' Goethe supposes nature ever to have had before her an ideal plant. Of this ideal every individual plant is a partial fulfilment. Not only are all plants formed after one type, but the appendages of every individual plant are repetitions of each other. The flowers are but the metamorphoses of the leaves. This doctrine was taken up with modifications by Schleiden, and again by De Candolle. It is now established as a certain truth in the science of botany. Lindley says that—

'Every flower, with its peduncle and bracteolæ, being the development of a flower-bud, and flower-buds being altogether analogous to leaf-buds, it follows as a corollary that every flower, with its peduncle and bracteolæ, is a metamorphosed branch. And further, the flowers being abortive branches, whatever the laws are of the arrangement of branches with respect to each other, the same will be the laws of the flowers with respect to each other.'

Professor Huxley dwells on a threefold unity of an organic existence. Besides the protoplasm there is a unity of faculty and a unity of form. The definition of man as an animal with a stomach who has to provide for some little animals like himself with stomachs, is a definition that for the most part embraces all creatures below man down to the lowest plant or animalcule. The sum of their existence, active and passive, is to

feed, grow, and reproduce their kind. This definition of man is the foundation of all sound philosophy. It was recognised by Goethe when he wrote—

“Warum treibt sich das Volk so und schreit? Es will sich ernähren
 Kinder zeugen und die nähren so gut es vermag
 * * * * *
 Weiter bringt es kein Mensch, stell'er sich wie er auch will.”

The nucleated protoplasm, which is the structural unit of the human body, is also the structural unit of every body, whether beast, fowl, reptile, fish, molluse, worm, or polype. The functions and forms of all bodies are alike. The material of which they are composed is the same down even to the shapes of the protoplasmic cells.

Mr. Stirling denies that the cells are alike. He quotes Stricker for the existence of cells of various forms. Some are club-shaped, some globe-shaped, and some bottle-shaped; some are sharp and some flat; some circle-headed; and if we were to reason from men to the structural units we might infer that some are beetle-headed. The discoveries of physiology only confirm the fact of likenesses more evident than men wish them to be. All bodies are subject to the same laws of birth, growth, decline, and death. The peculiar features of men appear in the faces of some animals, while the faces of some animals reappear among men as if to mock their pride and remind them of undesired relationship. A German physiologist says that a man with a pig's face is common, and with a pig's head probably more common still. Sometimes, as if to confirm De Maillet's doctrine of the marine origin of the race, we see men with the high shoulders

and the bulging eyes peculiar to the codfish. It is the recognition of a great fact in nature, and not a mere caricature of the artist, which represents some women as feline, and finds in sundry men the contour of countenance which is the property of the ass. To reconcile us to our lot in having so humble an origin Oken maintains that the human body in intro-uterine life passes through thirteen stages corresponding to the modes of existence of different organisms from a vesicle to a mammal.

The chief theological objection to the development doctrine is the supposition that it conflicts with the theistic argument from the evidence of design in nature. This has already been answered by the Duke of Argyll in what he says of the creative energy as being equally manifested, whether creation be one act or a progressive work. Mr. Martineau, whose 'Essays' we refer to mainly because of a remarkable essay on 'Nature and God,' gives a similar answer. The materialist can never get rid of that 'Force' in nature which can be due only to mind. To this conclusion both the physical and metaphysical scrutiny of 'Force' ultimately come. 'This resolution,' Mr. Martineau says, 'of all external causation into Divine Will at once deprives the several theories of cosmical creation or development of all religious significance; not one of them has any resources to work with that are other than Divine.' Every force is convertible with volition. Without this causality nothing can be done. Those who fancy that they can do without it commit 'a logical theft' upon it piecemeal. They 'crib causation by hairbreadths, to put it out at compound interest

through all time, and then disown the debt.' Mr. Martineau adds,—

'It is an equal error in the Theist to implicate his faith in resistance to the doctrine of progressive development—be it in the formation of the solar system, in the consolidation of the earth's crust, or the origination of organic species. That doctrine would be atheistic only if the first germ on the one hand, and the evolution on the other, were root and branch undivine—some blind material force that could set itself up in rivalry to God's.'

The objection of leading to Atheism was raised against the doctrine of types, and for a long time stood in the way of its reception even by eminent scientific men. Naturalists had hitherto found their best guide to the study of Nature in seeking the final cause, that is, the object or use for which anything was made. Lord Bacon had indeed intimated that this circle was too narrow, and that the first business of the student of Nature was to seek the physical cause rather than the final. He did not say that there is no final cause, no design, but that the purpose or design is accomplished by means of the physical cause. It is this hint of Bacon's which has served not only to reconcile typology and final causes, but to place the whole doctrine in a new form, and to add strength to it as an argument for Theism. Comparative physiology revealed members for the use of which no account could be given. If they were in use in one kind of animal, in others they existed as mere 'analogues,' 'homologues,' 'silent or abortive members.' The use of teats in females is evident, but no reason beyond symmetry can be assigned for their existence in males. The sutures in the head of

a child may render birth easier for the mother, but why should the same sutures be in the head of a bird which has only to break the shell of an egg? The ostrich does not fly, yet it has little abortive wings, 'analogues' of the wings of birds that fly, and of the fore-arms of all mammals. A fish has gills to enable it to breathe in the water, yet corresponding bronchial apertures are found in reptiles, birds, and even in mammals, including man. The use is apparently not the first or immediate object, but rather unity of plan. Sometimes the 'analogue' is used for different purposes according to the requirements of different animals, as the wing of the bird to fly in the air, or the paddle of the whale to help it through the deep, making a purpose beyond a purpose, or to quote Bacon's illustration, using these members as a wise politician makes other men the instruments of his will without letting them know at what object he aims.

Homology thus opened to human vision a vaster view of the order of the universe. It revealed more of the *mode* of the Divine working. It told us that though man is made in God's image, yet that we must not reduce the Divine Mind to the dimensions of the human. To the intellect of man it is given to know but in part. That knowledge is real so far as it goes, but it does not embrace the Infinite. To do this, in the words of Wieland already quoted, it 'will strive for ever.' Of the relation of typical forms to the doctrine of final causes, the best illustration we can remember is that of De Candolle. He supposes a splendid banquet. He is to find out or prove that

this banquet is not the result of chance, but due to the will of an intelligent being. The dishes are well prepared, and the selection of them implies a reference to the wants of the guests. So far the anatomist and physiologist have led us. But besides this, it is observed that the dishes which constitute this repast are arranged in a certain symmetrical order, such as pleases the eye, and plainly announces design and volition. If it is found that there are double rows of dishes, some real and some merely imitations which are of no use as to the repast, does it follow therefore that the idea of design must be rejected? De Candolle answers that so far from this he would rather infer that there had been an aim to make a symmetrical arrangement, and consequently the work of intelligence. Symmetry of arrangement is as decided a proof of design as adjustment of mechanism. Beauty and harmony bespeak an author as much as working for an end. Should the doctrine of development ever be proved, theology will have as little to fear and probably as much to gain as it has had from typology and morphology.

There are few things in this world more remarkable than the way in which men—even able and earnest men—persist in misunderstanding each other. Voltaire says that the reason why so few people understand Spinoza is because Spinoza did not understand himself. The Duke of Argyll thinks that Mr. Darwin does not quite understand himself. It is then no marvel that so many people have wrangled about the ‘Darwinian hypothesis.’ We read this passage in the ‘Reign of Law’ several times over to be convinced

that its obvious meaning really was its meaning. The noble author says :—

‘Strictly speaking, therefore, Mr. Darwin’s theory is not a theory on the origin of species at all, but only a theory on the causes which lead to the relative success or failure of such new forms as may be born into our world.. It is the more important to remember this distinction, because it seems to me that Mr. Darwin himself frequently forgets it.’

It seems to us that Mr. Darwin does account for the origin of species by ‘Natural Selection.’ That is to say, that in the great struggle for life the strong survive, and those that live become what they are according to the conditions on which life is granted to them. It is difficult for us to account for the Duke of Argyll’s interpretation of Mr. Darwin. But a far more remarkable misunderstanding is that of a criticism of the ‘Reign of Law’ in the *Quarterly Journal of Science*. This article was written by Mr. Wallace, one of our most eminent naturalists. He states what one would think is clear and manifest to all men, that the whole controversy between Mr. Darwin and his opponents is simply ‘a question *how* the Creator has worked.’ He then advocates a reign of law as if the Duke of Argyll had accounted for creation by ‘incessant interferences’ and the ‘direct action’ of the Divine Mind without law. The Duke of Argyll justly answers that the whole scope and aim of his book were quite the contrary. The idea of ‘incessant interference’ he holds to be essentially erroneous, as involving the idea of natural forces being agencies independent of the Creative Mind.

Mr. Wallace explains and defends Mr. Darwin’s

doctrine, which is, that the Creator has given to the universe self-developing powers. It has laws by which it is self-regulating, and 'the forms under which life is manifested have an inherent power of adjustment to each other and to surrounding nature.' The complicated parts of an orchis, to take the example given, were not contrived as a mechanic might contrive an ingenious toy or puzzle. They are the results of those general laws which were co-ordinated at the first introduction of life upon the earth. Mr. Wallace's doctrine simply is, that God made a machine, and left it eternally to spin. This was the eighteenth-century idea of the universe, with only this exception, that occasionally the Author interfered to keep it in repair. The Duke of Argyll finds law always present, but only as a servant, never as a master. It is the Creator who works; but He works by means of law. Gibbon supposed that he was refuting Christianity when he assigned the natural causes by which it gained strength in the world. The whole argument was the assumption that God never works by means, that He is absent from the universe, and that natural agencies are really without God in the world.

The Duke of Argyll's doctrine deserves more attention than it has yet received. It is pregnant with more meaning than the distinguished nobleman is probably himself aware of. It is clear and definite, but scarcely new. It is to be found in the sermons of the most thoughtful, we may say philosophical, preacher that ever adorned the Church of Scotland. Dr. Caird says:—

‘A human mechanist may leave the machine he has constructed to work, without his further personal superintendence, because, when he leaves it, God’s laws take it up; and by their aid, the materials of which the machine is made retain their solidity—the steel continues elastic, the vapour keeps its expansive power. But when God has constructed *His* machine of the universe, He cannot so leave it, or any the minutest part of it, in its immensity and intricacy of movement, to itself; for if He retire, there is no second God to take care of this machine. Not from a single atom of matter can He who made it for a moment withdraw His superintendence and support; each successive moment, all over the world, the act of creation must be repeated.’

The Deity must be present, and *with His laws*. There is something to think about here. Is not the omnipresence of God enough without His laws? Or, to put the question in another form, are His laws anything else but the mode of His working? Our great difficulty in approaching this question is to banish from our minds the human conceptions which steal in with the analogies. When we speak of laws, a machine and a machine-maker, and apply these ideas to God and the universe, we often forget that we are using metaphors. A man is distinct from the machine he makes, and the laws to which he commits it are laws external to himself. But the Omnipresent can never be absent from the universe. He must be in some way identical with His laws; His working must in some way be immediate working—even when it is mediate. Were we to say that nature is God, the saying would be false; for it would mean that God is not greater than nature. In another sense it would be true; for the most manifest thing in nature is the presence of God. The Duke of Argyll gives five definitions of ‘law.’ The first is that it is ‘simply

an observed order of facts.' This appears to us the most accurate of all the definitions of law when applied to the natural world. The other forms are really nothing more than observations in detail of particular parts of this 'observed order.' A law of nature simply means a certain order given in human experience. We are, then, quit of law in every human sense, and are alone with God only, and the mode of His working. We cease to be troubled about Hume's doctrine, that we know nothing of physical causation but the sequence of phenomena. The efficient cause is God. Here, too, we meet Mr. Huxley, who accepts this definition of law, and freeing himself from every possibility of being charged henceforth with materialism, avows that we know as little of 'matter' as we do of 'spirit.' The plain conclusion is, that the first and most certain existence in the world is the existence of the Divine Mind.

The doctrine of 'fiats,' or Divine 'interferences,' which were once regarded as the sole evidence of Theism, has disappeared from the pages of the Duke of Argyll, Mr. Huxley, Mr. Martineau, and, indeed, of almost every eminent writer on these subjects whose name we can recall. The continuity of nature's work is supposed to speak more of God than a sudden break. It is regarded, too, as a matter of fact, that no 'breaks' have existed, that nature has kept the even tenor of her way, making no pauses, but by incessant and progressive working has woven the vast web of creation. Yet the doctrine of 'interferences,' whether true or not, had a meaning in the wants and cravings of the human mind. While the machine

of the universe was regarded as a work left to itself, men thirsted after the living God. If He could not be found in the daily upholding of the universe He must be expected at intervals interfering with the ordinary working. It was on this principle that miracles spoke more of God than the order of nature. Thus, while the universe was regarded as a machine, the existence of miracles was declared impossible by those who denied the 'interferences.' Now, as the Duke of Argyll remarks, it is admitted on all sides that the question of miracles depends entirely on the evidence. This craving for 'interferences,' or, what is the same thing, this belief in 'interferences,' has possessed the human mind in every age, and under many forms. It was perhaps inevitable to those who could not realise the presence of Deity in the world of nature and providence. But religious beliefs cannot always be reduced to logical consistency. Even those who saw the 'Great First Cause' in the 'secondary causes,' were not satisfied unless the Deity worked also without secondary causes. And though the world was governed and their prayers answered mediately, they would have called it Atheism to say that God never works but according to the order of nature. This had its root in that craving for absolute certainty which seems to be an original element in the sentiment of religion. It is really a part of the question of miracles, and must end in the simple inquiry of the amount of certainty which is within the reach of man.

Supposing the doctrine of development were true, it would give a hint towards the settling of another

question which has been long agitated among theologians. This regards the mode of the Divine working in revelation. Has there been progression there too, or has revelation come only by 'interferences?' And with this opens up a wider question, if it has come by 'interferences' at all. In the latter case, if it has not, and we retain the idea of the universe as something apart from God, we fall into simple Deism. If we retain the idea which we have already reached, that the existence and presence of God are more certain than the existence and presence of the universe, we get a new glimpse of revelation, and with it a light which would dissipate many difficulties. We must, however, take care lest analogies mislead us. There is an *à priori* probability that the Divine working in the education of the human race will correspond to the order of the Divine working in nature. At the same time, there is something in the idea of revelation which suggests speciality. We cannot prosecute this subject further. There is a correspondence of difficulties between development in nature and in revelation. Mr. Darwin finds his new species in nature, but he only guesses at the mode of their introduction. We find higher waves of truth thrown up at different ages of the world, but the fact that they have come is more obvious than how they have come.

If space permitted, we might draw some more lessons from the theory of Development. One which, however, is really independent of the theory, though not of the facts on which the theory is built, should not be omitted. If there is anything which Mr.

Darwin has certainly proved, it is that qualities acquired by individuals are inherited by their descendants. Habits which are a second nature to those by whom they are first learned, are natural to their children. This seems true of all properties, whether physical, mental, or moral. The dog imparts its fidelity to its progeny. Ducks that have become weak of wing and strong of limb by domestication hatch ducklings with the same properties. What men teach animals they transmit to their descendants. How evident is it in human life that evil descends; and good, too, with many apparent, we dare not say real, exceptions, goes down from father to son. If example be good, it will have its influence; but there is a proverbial saying, verified by Mr. Darwin's philosophy, that good or evil runs in the blood.

There is yet another question which concerns the whole relation of natural knowledge to religious faith. This is independent of Mr. Darwin's theory being true or false. It belongs to the higher generalisation which includes all special inquiries. It is not properly the question of science and Christianity, but rather if science is in any way to determine, or even influence, our views of Christianity. The student of Nature has rightly claimed that he shall be free to follow whatever truth his method reveals. We are not disposed to complain of Mr. Huxley devoting himself exclusively to one field, nor even of the disciple of Comte for saying that we know phenomena, and nothing but phenomena. It is true in an obvious sense that there is a kind of knowledge acquired here which cannot be otherwise attained, and that

there is a method available here which is not available elsewhere. What we complain of is the implication sometimes made that this method reveals all that is really knowable by man. Lord Bacon made a compromise between science and religion, relegating the one to the province of knowledge, and the other to that of faith, forbidding them to meet or to influence each other. The same separation was made by the late Baden Powell, and the result which he everywhere offers is that in science we have real knowledge, that here we proceed on rational principles, but in religion we have to depend on some vague thing called 'faith.' We have no reason to doubt the religious sincerity either of Lord Bacon or of Baden Powell; yet they were subjected to the charge of irreligion—unjustly, indeed, yet not unreasonably. If our faith in Christianity is not founded on some principles of reason, it is a thing of too little value to be worth contending for. When Baden Powell relegates us to 'faith' for our grounds of religious conviction, 'we certainly feel,' Mr. Martineau says, 'that the door is rather rudely slammed in the face of the inquiry, and that we are turned out of the select society of philosophers who know, to take our place with the plebs who believe.' It is not to be denied that there is a true distinction between faith and knowledge. It has been made familiar in the words of Tennyson:—

'We have but faith, we do not know,
For knowledge is of things we see.'

Yet this faith is mainly founded on knowledge: it is strengthened and regulated by what we know; and

knowledge, even natural knowledge, is itself founded on 'faith'—it has to assume postulates. A man cannot believe contrary to what he knows. Between science and religion there may be a border-land, unreclaimed, but not irreclaimable: a final or absolute separation is impossible. Whatever Christianity may be in itself, it must present itself differently to different minds, countries, or ages of the world, and the highest evidence of its Divine origin will be that as ages advance in knowledge and things now secret become revealed, it will continue to be acknowledged divine.

Frohschammer is one of the three Munich professors who have distinguished themselves by their opposition to the proceedings of the Council now sitting at Rome. The other two are Döllinger and Huber. His book treats of the whole question of science and Christianity, but the greater part of it concerns Mr. Darwin's doctrine. This, indeed, is viewed as only a hypothesis; but the facts on which it rests are regarded of as much theological significance as if the hypothesis itself were established. It is admitted that science and the Bible are not in harmony on such questions as creation, the origin of man, and the relation of man to the lower animals. It is maintained that the Bible must be interpreted by what science teaches; and if so with the Bible, much more with the dogmatic teaching of the Church. Christianity is considered as subject to laws of development like to those which we see in the natural world. The spirit of it remains, but the form is ever changing. It is not remarkable that some of Froh-

schammer's books have been put into the 'Index.' His interpretation of what are usually reckoned the chief doctrines of Christianity would scarcely be tolerated by any sect in England. If he is an ordinary specimen of the Roman Catholic Broad Churchman it was quite time that the Pope assembled his 'Œcumenical.' The modern science and civilisation which Dr. Manning denounces as the children of darkness and the devil, are the day-spring from on high to the Catholic Professor of Munich.

III.

BROAD CHURCH CATHOLICS.*

THE day is probably far off when language will cease to be conventional. Until that time comes we must be content to struggle with the imperfection of the signs which represent our ideas. The words Broad Church Catholic seem a redundant tautology. Does not Catholic mean universal, all-embracing? Is it not another word for liberal or comprehensive, implying greatness of heart and soul, wide and far-reaching sympathy? Whatever may have been the original signification of the word, it is certain that those who are most eager to be called Catholics, are usually understood to have least of the spirit of true Catholicity. They start with a claim to some peculiar possession which is supposed to give them a right to be exclusive. Hence the fact daily to be seen, at least in England, and which put into language seems a paradox, that those who call themselves

* Contemporary Review, June, 1870.

Kirche und Kirchen, Papstthum und Kirchenstaat. VON J. J. IGN. DÖLLINGER. München, 1861.
Der Papst und das Concil. VON JANUS. Leipzig, 1869.

Die wahren Hindernisse und die Grundbedingungen einer durchgreifenden Reform der katholischen Kirche, zunächst in Deutschland erörtert. VON DR. A. PICHLER. Leipzig, 1870.

Das Christenthum und die moderne Naturwissenschaft. VON J. FRÖSCHAMMER. Wien. 1868.

Catholics are the most sectarian, while some of the smallest sectaries are, in spirit, most truly Catholic.

This paradox is due to the many conventional meanings of the word. The Roman Catholic limits it to those of his own communion. The High Anglican includes himself, the Greek Church, and as many other Churches as can boast a succession of bishops duly consecrated. The Church of England, in the only description which it ever gives of the Church Catholic, includes 'all who profess and call themselves Christians.' To this definition nearly all Protestant sects agree. The Church Catholic is regarded as the whole house of God throughout the world, with all its varieties of thought and language, with all the modifications of time and place and circumstance, with various degrees of perfection and imperfection, separated into sects and nations, but united before God and one in the name of Christ. Some go beyond this and include the world as potentially the Church. The world is the Church in virtue of the fatherhood of God, and Catholic because of the brotherhood of man.

It would make too long a digression to enter into the history of the word Catholic. It was claimed by all sects in the first centuries of Christianity. Each boasted that it was the Catholic Church. St. Augustine was asked by the Donatists to define Catholic. He answered that it meant 'over all.' It is the title of that Church 'which is diffused throughout the world, is found in all lands, and is everywhere known as the Catholic Church.' It was objected that a part of the world was pagan, another part heretical, how, then, could the Church be 'over all?' Augustine

answers that the promise was made to Abraham,—‘In thee shall all nations of the earth be blessed;’ and, again, that it is written in the Psalms concerning the Messiah,—‘He shall rule from sea to sea, and from the river to the end of the earth.’ To make his argument good, Augustine added,—‘Surely the promises of God cannot fail.’ The ‘*Orbis terrarum*,’ or Roman world, was supposed by Augustine to embrace all the inhabitants of the earth. They had been outwardly converted to Christianity. They were included in one empire, and the Church of the empire was, in idea, at least, the Church of the whole world. But the Donatists, like most heretics, were rather shrewd people. They hinted to Augustine that there might be nations on the other side of the world. Augustine answered that that could not be, for there was a great sea between us and the other side of the world, and it was impossible that any of the children of Adam could ever have crossed that sea. The Catholic Church had dominion over the whole world. It was to repress heresy and schism. It was Sarah the lawful wife, while the Donatists were Hagar, who was to be chastised till she returned to her mistress. The property of the Donatists was to be taken from them in virtue of the promise that the Messiah was to reign from the river to the end of the earth.

St. Augustine’s idea of the Catholic Church is the one which we usually associate with the Church of Rome. If, then, to ‘Catholic’ in this sense, we add ‘Broad Church,’ we make no tautology. We only try to express what we mean.

It is always with a singular interest that Englishmen think of Germany. No two nations, if we may speak of the Germans as a nation, are more conscious of brotherhood. They understand each other. They have been mutually indebted to each other, and both of them gratefully acknowledge their debts. No educated German is ignorant of English literature, and now happily in England the capacity to read German is part of the education of every well-educated man or woman. Sprung from the old *Teutones*, kindred in blood and thought and language, there are many things which unite the two races. But there is one supreme over all. That one is religion. Germany was the cradle of the Reformation. The Germans are Protestants. So are we. The name of Luther is a household word in England. We pronounce it with feelings of reverence akin to worship.

We have said that the Germans are Protestants, but this statement needs qualification. In number, not more than half the people are Protestants. That half is confessedly the higher, the better educated, the more influential. It is among the Protestants that the German spirit has had its best and highest incarnations. Our interest in Protestant Germany makes us almost forget that there is a Catholic Germany. This forgetfulness, however, will be remedied as we become familiar with the names of Döllinger, Huber, and Frohschammer—remedied, too, by the memory of recent vigorous protests of German archbishops, bishops, and cardinals, against what is properly and strictly Romanism. Rauscher and

Schwartzenberg, Hefele and Strossmayer, are already heroes with the English public.*

For some time after the Reformation the Catholics of Germany were zealous opponents of the Reformed religion. But in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, according to their own historians, they did but little for the Catholic cause, and still less for literature. Their prelates were princes, and the character of the ecclesiastic was frequently merged in that of the statesman. Any signs of life which their theologians manifested were in the direction of disobedience to the Roman See. Those who were most anxious for the conversion of Protestants regarded the authority claimed by Rome as a hindrance to the desired unity of the Christian world. In 1763, John Nicholas von Hontheim, Suffragan-Bishop to the Elector of Trèves, published a book under the name of Febronius, in which he maintained that the supremacy was conferred on the Roman Pontiffs by the Church, and not by Christ. He denied that the Pope had any proper jurisdiction or authority over all Churches, or that his laws had any binding force except through 'the unanimous adhesion of all bishops.' This work was condemned at Rome, but the doctrine of Febronius was generally received in the theological schools of Catholic Germany.

The reforms of the Emperor Joseph were all in the direction of securing the independence of the German Catholics. A check was given to the jurisdiction which the Papal nuncios had long exercised in Germany. The emperor, with the bishops, took the government of the Church into their own hands. In

* Since this was written the first three have submitted to the new dogma.

1786 the ecclesiastical Electors of Mayence, Trèves, and Cologne, with the Archbishop of Salzburg, met at Ems, and framed the articles known as the 'Twenty-six Points of Ems.' In these it was denied that the Roman See had any right to jurisdiction in Germany. The 'Twenty-six Points' were not received by the other prelates, and under the influence of external pressure they were revoked next year by their authors. In 1814, after the general peace, the German governments negotiated with Rome for new ecclesiastical organizations. Roman Catholic writers complain that the stipulations of the Concordats then made have never been honestly fulfilled: The prelates have supported the princes in giving less allegiance to Rome than was promised. The principles of Febronius appeared in an intensified form in a party known as 'Liberals,' or 'Anti-Celibates,' who advocated a German National Church, a German liturgy, the sacraments administered in German, and the abolition of clerical celibacy. Another party, called 'Hermesians,' were kindred to the Liberals. They took their name from Dr. Hermes, a Catholic professor at Bonn, who thought that by adopting Luther's doctrine of private judgment, he would be able to overthrow Luther's theology. Count von Spiegel, Archbishop of Cologne, with many of the clergy of Westphalia and the Rhine provinces, were numbered among the Hermesians. Both these parties as such have disappeared, and it is only within the last thirty years that the genuine Roman Catholic could look with any approach to satisfaction on the Catholicism of the Catholics of Germany.

The first theologian of Catholic Germany whose name became familiar to Englishmen was Möhler. Through him we learned something of Diepenbrock, Sailer, and other great prelates, who fairly represented the better side of the German Catholics. In Möhler there was something of what we see in our own Newman—a rational theology conjoined somewhat incongruously with a belief in infallibility. Möhler had been brought up a Catholic, but it was only Germany that could have produced such a Catholic. Protestantism helped to make him. In his first curacies of Walderstadt and Reidlingen he was reckoned a Rationalist. But this did not raise against him the persecution which it would have raised against a young Rationalistic curate in our Protestant Church of England. ‘It is allowable,’ said an old priest, in the spirit of the truest Catholicism, ‘for such a learned young man to believe a little differently from us old men.’ A few years later Möhler receded from Rationalism. And this he owed, not to Catholics, but to Planck, the Protestant Professor of Göttingen. The cure which Planck recommended was effectual. It was the study of the ancient Fathers. The spirit of reason, however, remained. It was fettered, but not dead. Möhler, like Newman, was a great master of dialect. Like Newman, too, he appealed to conscience, to reason, and to Scripture; and, like Newman, the force of his argument lay in giving a new colouring to Roman Catholic theology. Baur, one of Möhler’s ablest opponents, seized the vertebræ of the controversy when he told Möhler that he had not fairly stated the doctrine of his own Church.

Möhler was a great man, and great things were expected from him; but he passed away when he had scarcely reached the meridian of life. Then we became familiar with Döllinger, who is now the acknowledged intellectual leader of the Catholics of Germany. Several of Döllinger's works are translated into English, and are extensively read. There is probably no living German author so well known and so highly esteemed by English Protestants. We envy the German people, who, as Protestants and Catholics, can live together in peace, and discuss the questions on which they differ with mutual patience and forbearance. Catholicism, we use the term conventionally, is never presented to us with that tone of impartiality which is manifest in Möhler and Döllinger. In England it has so little of what is lovely, that when we hear of 'good' Catholics we think of the old proverb about Nazareth. Its priests, with downcast eyes, apparently ashamed to look honest Protestants in the face, steal through our streets, as if conscious of intrusion. Its laity, if we except some old families chiefly in the north of England, are a horde of degraded Irish, multitudes of whom storm the parish clergy in their vestries for charity, volunteering to change their religion for the smallest coin, but without the most distant intention of doing what they offer to do. The only arguments which we hear in favour of Catholicism are some anathemas against reason, culminating in a demand for submission of body, soul, and spirit to the See of Rome. To these may be added misrepresentations of Protestants and Protestant teaching in 'Catholic' reviews and news-

papers, generally the outcome of that wild exaggeration which is natural to the Irish mind. We grant willingly, on the other hand, that the spirit of the specially Protestant press is 'devilish.' Frederick Robertson says, in one of his sermons, 'The religious press of this country has a tongue set on fire of hell.' But, vile as some of our Protestant newspapers are, they are more than rivalled in baseness by those which boast themselves Catholic, whether Roman or 'Anglican.'

In the 'Church and the Churches' Döllinger speaks some severe truth concerning the Church of England; but, taking this book altogether, the estimate of Protestantism is impartial. He tells his brethren of the Church of Rome that for the sake of their own cause they must give up using their pulpits to abuse the Reformers. He would have, we imagine, but little sympathy with a sermon we once heard, which the priest began thus:—'In the sixteenth century there was a *blackguard* in Germany of the name of Luther.' A similar style of speaking of the Reformers has lately been tried in England by some of our imitation 'Catholic' Anglicans; but Döllinger, whose acquaintance with the history and literature of the Reformation is extensive and accurate, admits that the Reformers did a great work, and that the evils of the Church of Rome were past endurance. Luther made mistakes. Had he lived to renounce them his retractations would have been more numerous than those of St. Augustine. Döllinger says, though not in reference to Luther, 'It is a law as valid for the future as for the past, that in theology we can only through errors attain to truth.'

Döllinger acknowledges that Protestant Reformers and Protestant theologians have rendered great services to Christianity. He believes that four-fifths of our differences are misunderstandings; that when these are removed, and a desire for unity is really felt on both sides, then the reunion of Christendom will come. But Döllinger is not unfaithful to his profession as a Catholic. He believes in the infallibility of the Church, though not of the Pope. He does not advocate National Churches. The idea of a national Church is to him Pagan. These existed before Christianity, but with Christianity came Catholicity—that is, one Church for all lands. To preserve the unity of the Church, and to keep it independent of secular governments, it must have a spiritual head. The Bishop of Rome has always been this unifying and protecting power. The Papal See is inextricably interwoven with the being of the Church. Döllinger says that the first mistake of Protestantism is ‘the delusion that the Papal See has arrogated to itself a despotic and absolute power, and exercised it whenever it was not restrained by fear.’ ‘This delusion,’ he adds, ‘is generally diffused, especially in Germany and England.’ In these countries Protestants really believe that the Pope’s power is boundless, and that individual Churches are defenceless against it. But so far is this from being true, that the power of the Pope is very limited. Döllinger says it is universally admitted that the Pope cannot dispense with things which are commanded by Divine laws. He quotes and endorses the words of De Maistre, that ‘everything restrains the Pope — canon laws, national

customs, monarchs, tribunals, remonstrances, negotiations, duty, fear, prudence, and, chief of all, public opinion, the queen of the world.' He quotes, further, the words of Pius VII. and other Church authorities, denying that any absolute power resides in the Pope. He appeals to the declarations put forth in 1826 by the Gallican and Irish Churches, with the sanction of the Roman See, which affirmed that the Bishop of Rome had no jurisdiction in things temporal. He adds that in the middle ages 'the laws and rights in religious matters were the same for all. It was everywhere taught that not only every bishop, but the Pope himself, must, should he fall into erroneous doctrine, be deposed; and, in case of his perseverance in error, he must, like every other, be condemned.' Since this was written, Dr. Döllinger has learned that the 'delusion' is not entirely without foundation; and, should a certain dogma be established by the Council now sitting at Rome, the great German theologian, proud of the name of Catholic, will be in the same condemnation with the Protestants of Germany and England.

In the work of 'Janus' we advance some steps beyond Döllinger. The author is generally understood to be Huber, another professor in the University of Munich. Huber's studies hitherto have been mostly in philosophy. He has written, besides some smaller papers, a little book, called 'Philosophical Writings;' a treatise on John Scotus Erigena, illustrating the philosophy and theology of the middle ages; and another on 'The Philosophy of the Church Fathers.' The present work might have been written by an English divine of the seventeenth century. The standpoint, in fact,

is substantially the same as would have been taken by Andrewes, Bramhall, Cosin, or any of the defendants of the Catholicity of the Church of England against the accusations of the Church of Rome. 'Janus' strikes with even a sharper axe, and he has the advantage over them of the criticism of two centuries on disputed books and points of history. As a German Catholic, he has lived in the belief that the Church is independent of the Roman See. Like the other Catholics of Germany, he has been indulging in dreams of the reunion of Christendom. But the proposals of the Pope's Œcumenical have disturbed his repose.

There are two great parties in the Roman Catholic Church, and the first point of their difference concerns the bond which unites them. 'Janus' speaks of a reactionary movement which has been going on for twenty-five years, and which, by means of the Council, is preparing to take possession of the whole organic life of the Church. This movement is mainly the work of the Jesuits. Their ideal of a Church is a universal spiritual empire, with the secular arm as its servant, to punish heresy and check every kind of opposition. Our ideal of the Church, 'Janus' says, is separated from this by a great gulf. The Catholic Church is not the Papacy. That is but an excrescence entailing manifold diseases. The Primacy, in the judgment of all Catholics, was founded by Christ. Its type was ordained in the person of Peter. But this Primacy has been corrupted into a Papacy. The history of this transformation, as described by 'Janus' from its first germs to its present stage before the Roman Council, only illustrates the craving of man

for an absolute authority, with a fixed determination that if such an authority cannot be found it must be invented.

We cannot regard the difference between 'Janus' and 'true Catholics' as anything else but 'a great gulf.' It is the question of ecclesiastical authority against the Divine government of the world. Benedict XIII. condemned the whole of Christendom when it refused to acknowledge him; and when deposed by the Council of Constance, he declared from his castle of Peniscola, 'The whole Church is assembled in Peniscola, not in Constance, as once the whole human race was collected in Noah's ark.' To this the disciples of Loyola, 'Janus' says, will bring the Catholic Church, rather than admit the Divine right of reason and conscience. And when the educated classes of Europe are thoroughly forced out of the Church, then it will be easier to guide the ship, than it will be easier to keep the flock obedient to the shepherds. 'Catholicism, hitherto regarded as a universal religion, will, by a notable irony of its fate, be transformed into the precise opposite of what its name and notion imports.' This warfare against reason, civilisation, and human liberty, is not imaginary or inferential. It is openly avowed by the Jesuits and the advocates of Papal infallibility. They claim jurisdiction for the Church not merely over the minds, but over the bodies of men; a power to inflict bodily chastisement, to impose fasts or fines, to imprison, hang, or burn. 'The Syllabus condemns the whole existing view of the rights of conscience, religious faith, and profession; it is a wicked error to admit Protestants to equal poli-

tical rights with Catholics, or to allow Protestant immigrants the free use of their worship; on the contrary, to suppress them is a sacred duty, when it has become possible, as the Jesuit fathers and their adherents teach.' It is admitted that this spirit has been working for centuries in the Church, but it is denied that it is the spirit of the Church, or necessary to the idea of Catholicism. The peace of Westphalia was condemned by Pope Innocent X. because it secured to Protestants the free exercise of their religion and their admission to civil offices. Döllinger, in his zeal for reconciliation, ascribes the Pope's disapprobation of the peace of Westphalia to a clause which imported that every civil government was to enforce its own religion within its own dominions. But though this spirit of Papal supremacy has been working in the Church for ages, it is only in these last days that the necessity has arisen for a final effort. The world has been developing independently of the Church. The voice of reason has been speaking in the world's highway. Even Catholics have been judging for themselves. But now, at last, the Pope is to interfere. He is to explain the true idea of a Church; he is to set aside the old canon of Vincentius Lirinensis, 'Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.' He is to put an end to all differences about doctrine; he is to save all men from scepticism, by saving them from inquiry. The Biblical scholars of England and Germany are to be relieved from their arduous labours and their endless perplexities. A telegraph from Rome is to enlighten the world. No matter how ignorant the Pope may be, infallibility will serve for knowledge. In the expressive words of

Erbermann, a Jesuit professor of Mayence, the world henceforth is to be instructed in righteousness 'by the mouth of a speaking ass.'

'Janus' quotes many cases from history which prove that Popes in past times have not been infallible. Innocent I. and Gelatius I. declared that infants dying without having received the communion 'go straight to hell.' This doctrine was anathematized by the Council of Trent. Leo IX. and Gregory VII. re-ordained priests that had been ordained by simoniacal bishops, in opposition to the constant teaching of the Church, that ordinations are valid whatever be the personal unworthiness of the ordaining bishop. Pope Pelagius declared that the invocation of the Trinity was indispensable to a valid baptism; while Nicholas I. assured the Bulgarians that baptism in the name of Christ was sufficient. Stephen II. allowed marriage with a slave girl to be dissolved, and a new one contracted; whereas all previous Popes had pronounced such marriages indissoluble. Nicholas II. taught the Capernaic doctrine that Christ's body is sensibly touched by the hands and broken by the teeth in the Eucharist; 'an error,' 'Janus' says, 'rejected by the whole Church.' Pope Innocent maintained that the laws of Deuteronomy were binding on the Church, because that book is the second book of the law, and the Christian Church is the second Church. Pope Sextus V. published an 'authentic' edition of the Bible, and in a Bull declared it to be the only one which was true and genuine. It was found to contain two thousand errors. The copies were recalled, and a new and correct edition issued in its place.

According to the earliest authentic histories, the voice of the Bishop of Rome was not reckoned final. When Pope Stephen pronounced heretics' baptism valid St. Cyprian and Firmilian of Cæsarea denied the right of the Pope to dictate a doctrine to other bishops and Churches. Augustine, looking back to this controversy, says that Stephen's judgment was not received as the decision of the Church. In the Arian disputes, the Roman See was passive for half a century. The first Popes who took a part in them were Julius and Liberius. Julius pronounced Marcellus of Ancyra, the Sabellian, an orthodox Christian; Liberius condemned Athanasius, and subscribed to an Arian creed, giving a proof which satisfied all the middle ages that a Pope might fall into heresy. When Jerome declared that the world had become Arian, we might have expected that Catholics would have turned to the Roman See for deliverance from their perplexities. But we read only of synods. The Pope's name is never mentioned. In these times all dogmatic questions were settled by councils, and these were convoked by the emperors, not by the Popes.

The beginning of the Papacy is dated from the middle of the ninth century. It was founded on the forged decretals of Isidore, which pretended to be decrees of the earliest Popes, confirming the decisions of councils. This idea of a Papacy developed into a belief in infallibility. Isidore makes one of the early Popes say that 'the Roman Church remains to the end free from all stain of heresy.' Writings, too, were forged in the names of Fathers, and genuine writings were corrupted, to support the pretensions of the

Papacy. St. Augustine, speaking of the canonical books, said that those were pre-eminently attested which the Apostolic Churches had first received and preserved. This passage was changed into 'Those Epistles belong to canonical writings which the Holy See has issued.' This forgery served Peter Lombard and Gratian, and in later times Cardinals Turrecremata and Cajetan, for certain evidence that the great Bishop of Hippo raised the infallibility of the Holy See above that of the New Testament Epistles. Some extended the idea of Papal infallibility to that of Papal sinlessness. A rightly-appointed Pope was said to be holy, because of the merits of St. Peter imputed to him. But it was found difficult to maintain this in the face of the evil lives of many of the Bishops of Rome.

The doctrine of Papal infallibility found ardent supporters in the monks, who were independent of the bishops, and whose prerogative rested on Papal authority. It was enforced, too, by the Inquisition, in all countries where that institution was established. Gregory IX. on the strength of the fable of the Donation of Constantine, asserted that the Pope was lord and master over the whole world. Innocent IV. claimed to be supreme ruler of the spiritual and the temporal. St. Paul says, 'The spiritual man judges all things,' which some Popes understand to mean that they are to judge all nations. The Roman Church became the Roman Court. Instead of a community of 'clergy and laity bound together by the ties of brotherhood,' it became 'a chancery of writers, notaries, and tax-gatherers, a rallying point for clerical place-hunters from every nation in Europe.' Devoted

Catholic bishops applied to the Church the same prophecies which had been applied to it by the sectaries. It was the venal harlot whose nakedness was to be uncovered before all men. Even St. Bonaventura, whom the Pope had loaded with honours, and who was bound to Rome by the closest ties, declared the Roman Church to be the harlot who makes kings and nations drunk with her whoredoms. When Dante called the Papacy Antichrist, and applied to it the Apocalyptic prophecy, it was not from the blindness of Ghibelline party spirit; he was only expressing the judgment of many earnest Catholics in that age.

Dr. Pichler is one of Döllinger's most advanced disciples. He is considerably beyond 'Janus.' Döllinger and 'Janus' take their stand against Papal infallibility on the infallibility of General Councils. This, in Pichler's judgment, was the error of the Reformers. They asked a General Council. Trent came, and they were condemned. Was Trent not Œcumenical? Will the Liberal Catholics abide by the anathemas of the Council of Trent? If they do, what avails it that they reject the infallibility of the Pope? The Reformers, indeed, had a plea which modern Catholics have not. The decisions of the Councils of Constance and Basel gave them hope that a General Council would do justice to all sides. The illusion was dispelled by the Council of Trent. If the present Council decrees Papal infallibility, then it must be true, or we have the other alternative—a General Council is not infallible.

The true hindrance to the reformation of the German Catholic Church is, Dr. Pichler says, the influence

of Ultramontaniam. What that is may not be easily defined. When it comes in the gross, we can distinctly perceive it, but often it is infinitesimally diluted. Luther described it as that which is opposed to everything 'free, Christian, or German.' It consists of a claim put forth by the Church of Rome—or what, in one sense, is the same thing, the Court of Rome—with various degrees of authority to govern all Churches in all nations. 'Janus' says that the Papacy is no part of the Church. The 'true Catholics,' as they call themselves, make the Papacy the essence of the Church. Döllinger comes mid-way. He denies Papal infallibility; but he says that those who do not acknowledge the Pope, and receive his Church for their Church, separate themselves from the Church universal. Germany has been for ages in conflict with the spirit of Ultramontaniam. 'The divergence between it and the religious earnestness of the German people, became ever wider and deeper, till it found its strongest personal expression in Luther and Leo X.' After the Reformation, the Papacy trembled even for the hold which it had upon Catholic Germany. Since this century began, the Jesuits have been hard at work. Twenty or thirty years ago it was expected that the whole of Germany would soon be restored to the Church of Rome. These hopes have not been realised. In the judgment of 'Liberal' Catholics the Jesuits are hindering rather than furthering the return of Protestants to the Catholic Church.

The greatest enemies of the Church of Rome can have no more ardent wish than that the present Council would establish the dogma of Papal infalli-

bility. This would put the topstone on the Babel of confusion. It would bring definitely before the world what Roman Catholicism is. Pichler wishes that Protestants be told plainly how the Catholic Church regards them, and how by its own inherent principles it must regard them. Apologists for Catholicism in Germany show mercy to Protestants; but it is only in Germany that they are led to hope for mercy. In Italy they are told—as, for instance, by Cardinal Perrone—that ‘the leaders of Protestantism are men who, because of their evil deeds, deserve the gallows,’ and that they are ‘all, body, soul, and spirit, the property of the devil.’ The Church of Rome claims to be the only Church in which men can be saved. Let it only be known that this is the doctrine of the Church, and ‘Liberal’ Catholics will see that their position is no longer tenable. It has been said by Pressensé that ‘concerning nothing does greater ignorance prevail than concerning Catholicism.’

Pichler finds no hope for the Catholics of Germany but in separation from Rome. They must unite with the Protestants, and set up a National Church. The object of Ultramontanism is to crush that freedom which Catholics already possess. The real conflict is between the divine progress of the world and the authority of Rome. Pichler sees a new era of Christianity dawning before the German mind. It will be an era in which Christianity will acknowledge God in science, in civilisation, and in all the forms of human progress. Between this spirit and that of Rome there is a ‘great gulf fixed.’ It is useless to pretend union any longer, or to speak of it as possible. In separation

only is their hope. To this, Pichler says, 'Janus' and the liberal Catholics must come, if not, all they are saying and doing will come to nothing.

In Frohschammer we have an exposition of the Christianity which is henceforth to be preached to the Catholics of Germany. Its first principle is opposition to ecclesiastical authority. All progress is regarded as divine. The law of development to which every organism is subject is also the law of States and Churches, which are historical organisms. There is a law of death as well as of life. To it, too, States and Churches are subject; Christianity, at least in its externals, is not excepted. Times of transition in religious communities from life to death, and death to life, are times of trial, doubt, and difficulty. But, as in nature, the old form dies and the new one takes its place, so in religion the old organizations decay, and newer and higher forms of faith are evolved. It is vain for ecclesiastics to breathe their anathemas and denunciations against modern science, the culture of the age, and the free government of States. This is God's world, and progress is God's order. Too long has the Church been at war with God. Too long have the so-called princes of the Church persecuted the world's benefactors—the genuine priests of truth. Henceforth Christianity must take account of the world's progress, and acknowledge all that is in itself good. As grace supposes nature and is built upon it, so Christianity supposes science, and must embrace all that science teaches. Most men prefer a positive religion. It is easy; it saves inquiry and anxiety. But the problems which present themselves to us are

not problems of our making. We did not desire them, and to turn aside and disregard them would be to disregard the work which in our day God has given us to do.

Frohschammer starts with the familiar question of science and the Bible. The student of nature dwells chiefly on the discrepancies between them, while the theologian is deeply concerned to evince their harmony. But to harmonize the facts of nature with the statements of the Bible human ingenuity has laboured, and ever will labour, in vain. Theologians feel the necessity of saying, that though the Bible contains a revelation, yet there are things recorded in it which are not strictly true. Frohschammer wishes to approach the subject from a philosophical stand-point. He is to pursue the inquiry in subjection to natural and logical laws. He is to build on axioms that cannot be disputed, and to recognise the facts of the natural world. Theologians, he says, usually start from this principle, though without confessing it. They say that between nature and revelation there can be no contradiction; that nature can teach nothing contrary to what is revealed. But when nature does reveal something different from what the Bible teaches, theologians say that revelation is more to be trusted than human reason. To this it is answered that the truth of revelation is not so clear and immediate as an axiom or a fact in nature. The natural, or that which we know immediately, must be held as the foundation, and used as the criterion, of truth. A Catholic would add in addition to the Bible the authority of the Church; but this authority, Frohschammer conceives,

cannot rise higher or be more certain than the revelation itself, and must be subjected to the same criterion of natural truth. Without this foundation in natural reason we should be incapable of knowing anything. Whatever contradicts the faculty of knowing cannot be a truth of revelation. The authorities of the Roman Catholic Church have been compelled to act on this principle. They now admit the truth of the Copernican system, belief in which was once damnable heresy. Christianity has nothing to fear from science. Its essence as taught by Jesus remains the same, and as natural knowledge advances its divine origin will become more evident.

The first science which came in conflict with Church theology and Church authority, was the science of astronomy. Christ Himself taught nothing concerning the heavenly bodies. Religious and ethical doctrines are not inseparably connected with any natural sciences. Christ spoke of nature as it appeared to the people who were His hearers. But the system of theology which grew up in the Church incorporated the Ptolemaic astronomy. The earth was supposed to be the centre around which the sun, moon, and stars revolved. This seemed to correspond with the Mosaic account of the creation, and with the sun standing still on Gibeon, and the moon in the valley of Ajalon. It became connected with a theory of inspiration which regarded the letter of the Bible as inspired. For centuries theological writers followed this belief till the Church consciousness and Western science seemed to have been united for ever. Other things helped to confirm this view of the universe. The

doctrine of the Incarnation—that God became man, and died for the redemption of man—seemed to demand that the earth be the great centre of creation, and not a mere speck in the immeasurable universe. The Biblical accounts of heaven and hell, with the Church doctrine of angels, and Aristotle's doctrine of spirits guiding the stars, were all in harmony with the system of Ptolemy.

In the middle of the sixteenth century, Copernicus published his six books concerning the revolutions of the heavenly bodies. The sun no more went round the earth. It was discovered that the earth was but a planet—one of an innumerable multitude that travelled through boundless space. The meaning of many texts of Scripture now became doubtful, and many dogmas of the Church untenable. Even the doctrine of the Incarnation seemed to vanish. Heaven could no longer be regarded as above us, nor hell as beneath us. The very existence of Christianity seemed to be in danger. Catholics and Protestants united to defend the system of Ptolemy. The doctrine of Copernicus was said to be contrary to Scripture, to the voice of the Church, and to Catholic antiquity. In 1616, the works of Copernicus were put into the 'Index' as destructive of 'Catholic truth.' The Roman Curia and the Inquisition evinced the strength of their convictions in the persecution of all who taught the doctrine of Copernicus. It was not until 1835, when the works of Copernicus were taken out of the Index, that Rome ceased to maintain, in spite of astronomy, that the sun went round the earth. This late acknowledgment of the truth of the system of Coper-

nicus is a confession, even on the part of the Church of Rome, that ecclesiastical authority must yield to the truths of reason. Science must be free ; it can not give up what it knows to be true because of anything in the Bible, or supposed to be in the Bible. It was well that astronomy was a definite science. When it came in conflict with Church authority and the old doctrine of Bible inspiration, there was no question which side had to yield. Astronomy has vindicated the cause of freedom for all science. It is vain, therefore, for the Pope to send forth his briefs, as he did so late as December, 1863, forbidding the faithful to receive the conclusions of scientific men, and commanding them to abide by the decrees of Popes and Councils ; yea, even the decisions of the Congregation of the Index.

Frohschammer maintains that the substance of Christianity was not touched by the system of Copernicus, but rather Christianity by the new science received a deeper meaning. Men learned to see God in the order of nature. They ceased to look for Him, as the Pagans did, merely in the extraordinary and the miraculous. Lalande said that he had searched the whole heavens and had found no God. That is, Frohschammer says, no God according to the popular and in some respects heathen idea : no God working by miracles and interferences, but a God working by law and reason, and everywhere by His works manifesting Himself to the mind of man. There we see Him as a bountiful Father, as spirit and love, as the omnipresent and all wise. Aristotle's argument for the existence of Deity, which postulates a first mover,

may not now have the force which it once had, but the principle is still valid. The argument receives another application when not a first mover, but an incessant worker is demanded for the necessities of creation.

The scientific question of the present day, with which theology is most concerned, is that of development in nature. Mr. Darwin's doctrine may not be proved. The origin of man may still be regarded as a mystery. But it is impossible now to receive the Mosaic accounts as more than the popular ideas of the time when they were written. They are as much contrary to the ascertained facts of nature as the Mosaic astronomy to the system of Copernicus. The Bible represents creation as produced at once, and everything perfect as soon as it appeared. All was 'good,' that is, free from imperfection, suffering, or pain. The world was paradisiacal. Science, on the contrary, demonstrates that nothing was perfect at its first creation. From the very beginning of creation all living organisms have been subject to disease and death. Perfection lies in the future, not in the past. The ideal of creation was perfect from the first, but the realisation of the ideal is to come. The Mosaic accounts of the creation of Adam and Eve, their innocency and their fall, are not regarded as credible in the light of known natural facts. The doctrine of original sin, which the Church elaborated out of the fall, is without any good foundation. In the interests of a speculative theology St. Paul spoke of sin entering by one man. The human consciousness of guilt, and the sense of Divine forgiveness, are the essential

truths of the speculative doctrines of original sin and redemption by a price. The Book of Job, which confessedly has for solution the problem of the existence of evil, does not refer to the record in Genesis, which, if meant for what it is understood to be, would have settled the question at once. There is not a word of birth-sin. The whole argument is resolved into the power and wisdom of God. The principle is distinctly renounced in this book that physical suffering is a punishment for moral evil. It was renounced, too, by Christ Himself, when He said that neither 'this man nor his parents have sinned that he was born blind.'

This mode of viewing Christianity is not new to those who are familiar with German theology. To those who meet it for the first time it seems to deprive them of all certainty about religion. At this point its advocates are prepared with an answer, and one which deserves all attention, for it is, in reality, the foundation principle where the difference begins. We suppose an infallible Church or an infallible book, a miracle or some immediate interference of Deity, which gives us certainty beyond what is given in the order of nature. The answer is, that no such certainty exists for us. Like everything around us we are being developed. God is teaching us, but teaching us in His own way. Shall we go on inventing schemes of revelation, or shall we be content to learn of God as He chooses to reveal Himself? In one place Fröhschammer says that Christ did not establish a Church with an external organization after the pattern of Judaism. He did not give a system of

doctrines, ceremonies, and prescriptions. He simply asked a free, child-like disposition towards God, and a practical love to man.

Frohschammer, we believe, is still a Catholic, nor do we know that he intends leaving the communion of the Church of Rome.* He professes to take a middle course between Protestantism and Romanism proper. He wishes to stand on the same platform as Döllinger, in union with Rome, but independent of Rome. He has been denounced by the Curia, indexed by the Congregation, and removed from the office of university preacher. We have read, too, that Catholic students are forbidden to attend his lectures. In the Church of England Broad Churchmen have difficulties; and on this very question they are divided whether they ought to separate or to continue under the old creeds. The Vice-Master of Trinity wishes to resign his orders, if it could be done, rather than subscribe, in the sense of a very modified subscription, to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion. How would he writhe, if to Professor Frohschammer's advanced theology, he had to add the decisions of the Council of Trent? We dare not judge for others, but there is much to be said in favour of keeping to the old building, and submitting to conditions which are inevitable. The old leaves may be allowed to hang. They will fall freely when the new ones begin to appear. The old walls may be allowed to stand till the stones are prepared for the glorious temple that is to arise.

* He was excommunicated in 1864, but has never formally withdrawn from the Catholic Church.—X.

But the practical and immediate question is the tenableness of the position which Liberal Catholics are now occupying. It is said that Rome never changes, but it is true that the policy of Rome is not always the same. The Pope was willing to sanction the English service, as it stood in the time of Elizabeth, on condition of submission to the Roman See. But in the time of Edward, by the Bull of Pius III., all England was excommunicated—Protestants and Catholics alike. The Catholics of that time wished to retain the same relation to Rome as Döllinger now advocates. They believed in the Pope's doctrines. They wished to be in union with the Roman See. They acknowledged the Papal Primacy, though they took the oath of the royal supremacy. The Reformers adopted the Thirty-nine Articles, which taught the Swiss theology; but it is only trifling with words to say that this theology is not Catholic. It was the theology of St. Augustine, the most Catholic of all the fathers, whose name alone had greater weight than all antiquity. Like Luther and Savonarola, all our Reformers were willing to abide by the decisions of a General Council. But when Trent came the Reformed Churches were excluded. Bishop Jewel complains bitterly that they were condemned without being heard. This was manifestly unfair, for it is admitted on all hands that the need of reformation was urgent. The Reformers had been rectifying evils in their own National Churches, and ought not, on that account, to have been excluded from a General Council of the whole Western Church. But to us Pichler's argument, that General Councils are

fallible, is invincible. If not, we ought to accept the decisions of Trent, and, if the present Council decrees it, the infallibility of the Pope.

We seem to recognise a difference between Döllinger's position and that of 'Janus.' The latter denies the Papal supremacy though admitting the Primacy.* He maintains that National Churches may be members of the Church Catholic though owning no allegiance to the See of Rome. This was the position of English High Churchmen in the time of the Stuarts. It is still the position of our 'Catholic' Anglicans. Like 'Janus' they suppose the Church infallible, and like him they rest on the Divine right of Episcopacy. The Pope refuses to acknowledge this position as Catholic, even though like our advanced Ritualists they receive most of the doctrines of the Church of Rome. But is it tenable in itself? Does not the infallibility of the Church, in the sense necessary to the argument, disprove itself? To say nothing of the uncertainty of doctrine, can we suppose the Church to have been infallibly guided by the Holy Spirit when the clergy as a body were notoriously immoral in their lives? 'Janus' says that though at the present time in Germany the majority of the priests are above suspicion, yet before the Reformation there was not more than one in thirty who even professed ordinary morality. And as to Episcopacy, are not the arguments as strong for the Divine right of the Pope as for the Divine right of the bishops? This subject has been discussed exhaustively in England, where the Divine right of

* It is now generally understood that Döllinger is 'Janus.' He employed Huber and others to collect materials, but he is himself the real author.

a bishop is in the last stage of infirmity. Moreover, Episcopacy is not sufficient to secure the unity of the Church. There are bishops against bishops, and episcopal churches against episcopal churches. The Donatists of Africa had more bishops than the orthodox.

It scarcely seems possible for the controversy with Rome to enter upon another phase. It has already passed through almost every conceivable form. The most characteristic part of the present opposition to Rome is the theological as represented by Frohschammer. The Reformers of the sixteenth century appealed to the infallible Bible against an infallible Church. It was a great reformation to go back to the original documents of Christianity. But it is not to be expected that the men of the nineteenth century can see everything with the same eyes as the men of the sixteenth. We are carried onward by the stream of progress whether we will it or not. English Protestants may not agree with all that German theologians have to say. But they cannot be unconcerned spectators in the present conflict between Germany and Rome. It is truly a battle for

‘Science, freedom, and the truth in Christ.’

‘The combat deepens.’ In the words of our poet we say :--

‘On ye brave!
Wave, Munich, all thy banners wave!
And charge with all thy chivalry!’

IV.

DR. PUSEY AND THE ULTRAMONTANES.*

THE peace between Rome and England is not yet concluded. Earnest, simple-hearted Dr. Pusey continues his 'Eirenicon.' He speaks of peace, and he is answered,—What hast thou to do with peace? His words, they say, are very swords. The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau. Dr. Pusey is regarded by Roman Catholics as a Jehu at the gate of Jezreel, a Zimri who slew his master; yea, he has even been called an incarnation of the archfiend who has taken upon him the office of the accuser who accuses the brethren day and night. Jesus said, 'Blessed are the peace-makers;' but Rome's blessing is 'anathema sit.'

* Contemporary Review, July, 1870.

First Letter to the Very Rev. J. H. Newman, D.D. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. James Parker & Co. 1869.

Is Healthful Reunion Impossible? A Second Letter to the Very Rev. J. H. Newman, D.D. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. James Parker & Co. 1870.

The Reunion of Christendom. By HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster. Longmans, Green, & Co. 1866.

Essays on the Reunion of Christendom. With an Introductory Essay by the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. J. T. Hayes. 1867.

A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on his recent Eirenicon. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D. Longmans, Green, & Co. 1866.

Peace Through the Truth. By the Rev. T. Harper, S.J. Longmans, Green, & Co. 1866.

Le Mouvement Catholique dans l'Anglicanisme.—Revue du Monde Catholique. Février et Mars. 1866.

Dr. Pusey, however, is undaunted. To use his own words, he is not to be 'discouraged by censures, disheartened by mistakes, sickened by the supercilious tone of some in high station, or cowed by rebuffs.' There is such a thing as faith, and men whose convictions are firm, and who act upon them, certainly do great things in this world. Faith 'laughs at impossibilities.' The greatest revolutions that have taken place among men have been brought about by faith. It is not necessary to suppose anything supernatural in this, for faith leads to action, energy, and sacrifice.

But, whether Dr. Pusey succeeds or fails, the movement in which he has borne so conspicuous a part will ever be regarded as one of the greatest events in the history of Christianity. The multitude of men may despise it. They may laugh at the certainly ludicrous imitation of Catholicism to which it has given rise. Sorrow and anger may alternate in their breasts, as they seem to be deprived of the Protestant heritage of their forefathers, won for them at the stake and the scaffold. But even granting that all this is just, yet the 'Catholic revival' is a great event in the religious history, not merely of England, but of the world. It has pressed the demand for an answer to two urgent questions, which, strange as it may appear, have never yet been fully answered,—What is Protestantism? and, What is Catholicism?

The reunion question is the most recent phase of 'Anglo-Catholicism.' We can scarcely be wrong in saying that Dr. Pusey's 'Eirenicon' is founded on Tract XC., written by Dr. Newman, who soon after found himself at rest in the Church of Rome. Dr.

Newman had been led to embrace some doctrines that had been rejected by the Reformers of the Church of England. He was anxious to reconcile these doctrines with the formularies of the Church of which he was a minister. The Prayer-Book, from its very nature, was found not to have many difficulties; but the Thirty-nine Articles, which defined the doctrines of the Church, were seriously in the way. They were, in a great measure, taken from the confessions of the Reformed Churches abroad. The men who compiled them were known to have had intimate relations with the Reformers of these Churches. The Articles themselves abounded in negative propositions, and these were almost entirely aimed at what was understood to be the doctrine of the Church of Rome. Yea, even the affirmative parts were mostly counter-statements of what was called Roman teaching. At first sight the Articles appeared to be, what the Reformers really intended them to be, a moat and a fortification to defend the Church of England in prospect of the Roman enemy. But Dr. Newman had an intellect of marvellous ingenuity, yet, so far as intention went, perfectly honest. He could not ignore the fact that the Articles were Protestant—the product of a Protestant age; but he thought that a ‘Catholic’ meaning might be put upon them, so that they might be subscribed by those who believed the contrary of what the compilers intended. It was admitted that they condemned, not merely the dominant errors of the time when they were written, but also the ‘authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome.’ They were, however, supposed to be compatible with

what was called 'Catholic' or 'primitive truth.' Dr. Newman was at last convinced that they were not. The result is known.

Dr. Pusey, while admitting that he does not take the Articles in the sense of those who wrote them, yet maintains that, without violence to their literal and grammatical meaning, they may be interpreted so as to agree with the decrees of the Council of Trent. Here then is a basis for reunion, founded on the creeds of the two Churches. Of course the Tridentine creed has also to be *explained*. But in the natural uncertainty of human words, and the remarkable uncertainty of what is Roman Catholic doctrine, it is even easier to find a serviceable interpretation of the decrees of Trent than of the English Articles.

At the Reformation the greatest doctrinal question between the Reformers and the Church of Rome concerned the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Archbishop Cranmer said that it was with this sacrament that 'the devil had craftily juggled.' The Church of Rome taught that, by an act of omnipotence greater than the act of creation, by means of the blessing of the priest, the bread and wine were changed into the actual body and blood of Christ. This was, and is, the central doctrine of the Roman system. It is called Transubstantiation. Article XXVIII. of the Church of England says that it 'cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.' Here, surely, is a sufficiently distinct renunciation of the Roman doctrine. But it happens that substance is

just one of the things of which we know nothing. We only know accidents or qualities. The underlying essence or substratum cannot be defined. In fact, its existence, apart from these accidents, cannot be demonstrated. What is the meaning then of a change of *substance*? Is it a change of accidents, or of this unknown quantity? The authorised Roman teaching is, that the substance is changed, while the accidents remain. The body and blood of Christ exist under the species of bread and wine. But there was also a popular doctrine, or 'dominant error,' that Christ's body with its accidents was present, and that it was eaten as the men of Capernaum understood the discourse about eating His flesh. The Article is evidently directed against the authorised doctrine, and *à fortiori* against the 'dominant error.' But then the change is an unknown change of something unknown. Perhaps the matter or *ὕλη* of the philosophers is only an illusion. Perhaps the substratum of all things is spirit. The Church of England admits a spiritual presence. The Roman doctrine at the most is an invisible presence, under the accidents or species of the bread and wine. Dr. Pusey says that the Schoolmen taught that the bread and wine in the Eucharist lost their qualities of supporting and nourishing. But the Council of Trent declared that the 'bread retains the quality natural to bread.' The presence of Christ then is the presence of a spiritual substance, so that the Roman Church agrees with the Anglican in teaching a spiritual and not a carnal presence.

Connected with this doctrine was the sacrifice of the mass. The Reformers called the Church of Rome

‘the Upas tree of superstition.’ They determined to cut it to pieces, root and branch. Article XXXI. says—‘The sacrifices of masses, in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.’ In all ages of the Church of England, in all controversies, by all theologians since the Reformation to the days of Dr. Newman, this Article was understood to condemn the sacrifice of the mass in the Church of Rome. The counterpart of the phraseology is found in Bishop Ridley, who calls the mass ‘a new blasphemous kind of sacrifice to satisfy and pay the price of sins both of the dead and of the quick.’ To this correspond the words of Archbishop Cranmer: ‘The Romish Antichrist, to deface this great benefit of Christ, hath taught that His sacrifice upon the cross is not sufficient hereunto without another sacrifice devised by him, and made by the priest.’ As Cranmer and Ridley lived before the Council of Trent, it is just possible that they may not have known the authorised doctrine of the Church of Rome. They may have spoken of the mass as they had themselves learned it, and as it was generally taught and understood by the priests and people of that time. Gardiner, however, and the defendants of Catholicism denied the inference that the sacrifice of the mass interfered with the one sacrifice of Christ. Yet the deliberate judgment of the Reformers clearly was that the mass is a blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit. But the Article does not say so. It only speaks of ‘masses.’ It may, therefore, according to

Dr. Pusey, be understood as referring to a custom prevalent at the time of buying and selling masses, which was afterwards condemned by the Council of Trent.

These questions, with many others in debate between the Reformers and the Church of Rome, ran up into the higher questions which related to the authority of the Church and the place of the Scriptures in reference to the Church. Article XX. says—‘The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies and authority in controversies of faith.’ This clause was not in the Articles in 1552 nor in 1562, when they were subscribed by both Houses of Convocation; but it effected a surreptitious entrance before the Articles received the assent of the Crown. It first appeared in the Latin edition of 1563; but it was not in the English edition ratified by Parliament that same year. The second clause of the Article is usually understood to limit, if not to neutralise, the authority claimed in the first. It says—‘Yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God’s word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another.’ Nevertheless, the clause remains, declaring that the Church has ‘authority in controversies of faith.’ This, Dr. Pusey says, is a Divine authority. It must be if the Church has power to decide in matters of faith. It implies the necessary preservation of the Church as a whole from error. It is the fulfilment of the promise, ‘Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world.’ The Church tells us what is the Catholic faith, and

what must be believed as necessary to salvation. The Church must not contradict Scripture nor herself. The Fathers of the later Councils began by expressing their assent to the earlier. It is not open to individuals to criticize, by their private judgment, the 'Catholic truth,' which has been agreed on by the whole Church. This, of course, is a long way short of the claim of the Church of Rome to speak infallibly on any controversy that may arise. But then the infallibility of the Church of Rome is something afloat. Nobody knows exactly where it is or what it is. Two things so indefinite as the authority of the Catholic Church and the infallibility of the Roman Church may meet somewhere and touch each other at some point.

Article VI. says—'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought necessary or requisite to salvation.' Then follows a list of the books which are 'Scripture,' that is, Scripture to be used for establishing doctrine. From this list the Apocryphal writings are excluded. It is not said who is to decide whether or not any doctrine has been 'proved' by Scripture. The Article, in its obvious meaning, seems to imply the Protestant doctrine of the right of private judgment. But if connected with the clause in Article XX., about the authority of the Church in controversies of faith, it may be understood to have another meaning. We cannot adopt the doctrine of the infallibility of General Councils, for Article XXI. says that 'they may err,

and sometimes have erred, in things pertaining to God ;' but we have the 'Catholic Church,' with traditional creeds, doctrines, and interpretations. Some General Councils may have erred, but all have not. Those which have not erred are Catholic. That they have not erred is the test of their Catholicity or Œcumenicity. Who is to decide which General Councils have erred and which have not, is to be settled by Dr. Pusey and those who agree with him. The apparent Protestantism of Article VI. is supposed to be removed. The right of private judgment is denied. The meaning of the Scriptures is to be learned from the traditional interpretations of the 'Catholic' Church.

It is assumed by Dr. Pusey and his party that the Church of England was not reformed according to the Scriptures alone, but according to the Scriptures as understood by the Fathers. It can scarcely be a mistake to say at once that, in the sense intended, this is a supposition without any foundation. It is a principle never announced in the writings of the Reformers. Cranmer and Ridley, considering the great ignorance of the common people, decided as a matter of policy, that the changes in the services of the Church should be as few as possible consistently with the entire elimination of Roman doctrine. It is a matter of history that in this they had not the agreement of Hooper, and were but partially favoured by Latimer. The principle of the English Reformation, stated expressly by Bishop Jewel, is, that the appeal is made to the Scriptures alone. Then followed the question as to the Fathers, which simply

was, that they are on the side of the Church of England rather than on that of Rome. The solitary passage adduced by Newman and Pusey for their views of the Patristic character of the English Reformation is from a canon in the reign of Elizabeth. This canon enjoins that 'preachers should be careful that they never teach aught in a sermon to be religiously held by the people except that which is agreeable to the doctrines of the Old and New Testament, and which the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected from that very doctrine.' But there is nothing to intimate that this canon meant more than Bishop Jewel's principle, that Roman doctrine was not to be found in the Fathers, and therefore was not to be taught in the Church of England. It was in the same reign that a Convocation gave a semi-official authority to Bullinger's 'Decades,' commanding the less educated clergy to find there the material for their sermons.

Article XXV. reduces the sacraments of the Gospel to two, rejecting five of the Roman sacraments. With these five were connected many of the superstitions which the Reformers had to remove. They declared that they were not sacraments of 'like nature with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.' But the word sacrament has a very general meaning. Whatever is a visible sign of the Divine goodness may be a sacrament. The rainbow is a sacrament. The flowers of spring are sacraments. All nature is a sacrament. The Protestant meaning of the Article was clear enough. The five rejected

sacraments were regarded as merely of ecclesiastical authority, and might, therefore, be either retained or laid aside. Confirmation, orders, and matrimony were retained: the first because it was an old and useful custom, the second for the sake of order, and the third because no reformation could abolish matrimony. Penance and extreme unction were closely interwoven with the popular superstitions. The Prayer-Book recommends confession to those who are troubled in conscience, as a preparation for the Lord's Supper. But penance, properly speaking, as well as extreme unction, departed from the Church of England at the Reformation.

Dr. Pusey passes in review these five rejected sacraments, lamenting the loss of extreme unction, yet maintaining that in substance the other four are still retained as sacraments. The mode of proof is to have recourse to the Prayer-Book and Homilies, connecting together some stray passages, and interpreting them by the light of what is called the 'Catholic' Church. The principle by which Dr. Pusey interprets the Articles is to take them as they stand, and see what the words may be made to mean apart from the history of the times or the known sentiments of the Reformers. But while all external light on the Protestant side is excluded, the Articles are to yield to every 'Catholic' phrase, and every overlooked remnant of the old superstition that can be picked up in any unswept corner of the Homilies or the Prayer-Book. There is no Protestant who is unwilling to abide by the Homilies, and to subscribe to the words of Article XXXV., that they contain a 'godly and wholesome doctrine

and necessary for these times.' But no man is required to subscribe to every sentence in the Homilies; and Dr. Pusey, least of all men living, would like to be bound even by their general teaching. They were written by men whose sentiments differed widely; by the 'Catholic' Bishop Bonner and the Presbyterian Prebendary of Canterbury, Thomas Becon; the judicious Archbishop Cranmer, and the glory of the Elizabethan prelates, the learned Jewel. The Homilies indeed *contain* a 'godly and a wholesome doctrine;' but they are full of blasphemy, both against the Pope and the devil. When Dr. Newman applied his alembic to the Homilies, all the 'Catholic truth' he could distil out of them was a few unguarded sentences chiefly from the Fathers, some general statements about the primitive Church, the application of the word 'Scripture' to the Apocryphal writings, and sometimes ordination or matrimony called a sacrament. The exility of the evidence from the Homilies is in strange contrast with the immensity of the conclusion.

It is naturally an important matter for Dr. Pusey's object to be able to prove that the Church of England has retained valid Orders. Without this it would be idle to speak of the Church of England being a part of the Catholic Church, while the necessity of an Episcopal succession is regarded as the first requisite of Catholicity. Now, whatever Roman Catholics have to say against the validity of English ordination, the historical fact cannot be denied that at the Reformation the Episcopal succession was not broken. Dr. Pusey makes a great matter of this. He finds the consecrators of Parker were anxious to adhere to the

ancient forms. They looked out for a precedent, and found one in the case of Archbishop Chichele, who was consecrated at a time when the intercourse between Rome and England was interrupted. They used as the words of consecration, 'Take the Holy Ghost,' which they had translated from the Exeter Pontifical. To make sure work of it, all the four consecrating bishops put their hands on the archbishop's head, and all four repeated the words of consecration. Dr. Pusey adds, 'Surely this care to do what the Church had done is, in itself, evidence enough of the *intention* required!' It is difficult to enter into men's intentions, but it is not difficult to know that there were many reasons in simple policy why the old forms of consecration should be retained. We say nothing of the fact that the establishment of an Episcopal Church at all was the will of the Queen rather than of the men who were made bishops. The Zurich Letters sufficiently reveal the unepiscopal dispositions of Elizabeth's first prelates. But to speak only of the four consecrators of Parker. They were Barlow, Coverdale, Scory; and Hodgskins. The last was only a suffragan. Of him and Scory we know nothing, except it be that they preferred exile rather than conformity under Mary. Miles Coverdale, all the world knows, was a Puritan. He and Scory refused to wear Episcopal robes at the consecration, and officiated in Geneva gowns. Coverdale was never restored to his diocese. Conformity to the Church was so little to his mind that the rest of his days were spent, for the most part, in poverty and persecution. As to Barlow, his judgment of the value of consecra-

tion is on record. He said in a sermon, that 'if the king's grace, being supreme head of the Church of England, did choose, denominate, and elect any layman, being learned, to be a bishop, he, so chosen, without mention being made of orders, should be as good a bishop as I am, or the best in England.' This is enough; but he adds, 'Wheresoever two or three simple persons, as cobblers or weavers, are in company, and elected in the name of God, there is the true Church of God.' So far as Barlow was concerned, the renowned Nag's Head in Cheapside was as fit a place for the consecration of an archbishop as the chapel at Lambeth Palace. We cannot undertake to speak of his 'intention.' But we can scarcely doubt that if William Barlow and Miles Coverdale had known the use which Dr. Pusey was to make of their consecrating an archbishop, they would sooner have put their hands into the fire than laid them on the head of Matthew Parker.

Dr. Pusey's Church of England is something altogether different from the old Church of England, of which we read in history, and which we find in the writings of the old English divines. The reunionists generally make an effort to reconcile the old Reformed Church with their 'Catholic' ideas. When they fail they usually revenge themselves by a kick at the Reformers. The bishops of whom Dr. Pusey speaks, as so anxious to preserve the 'Catholic' faith and order, are dismissed by one of the Reunion Essayists as 'the whole tribe of Calvinistic prelates under Elizabeth.' They were not able, he adds, 'to root out faith and love' from the people, nor to prevent

them still 'piously drawing the sign of the cross on forehead and breast.' Beyond all controversy Elizabeth's bishops were Calvinists. They simply conformed to Episcopacy. There is no evidence that one of them believed in the Divine institution of bishops. In fact, that doctrine was unknown in the Church of England till Bancroft, in 1588, preached his famous sermon at St. Paul's Cross. Whitgift was then archbishop, and, tired of his long warfare with the Puritans, he wished that Bancroft's doctrine were true, for it would be a short and easy method of dealing with the Nonconformists. An ecclesiastical polity by Divine right was first maintained by the Presbyterians. It is almost the sole subject of the discourses of Thomas Cartwright. It was the essence of the railings of Martin Marprelate. 'The Lord's discipline' was the Puritan's phrase for the polity of the Church as it ought to be. The doctrine continued among the Independents. It is traceable, for instance, in the works of Thomas Goodwin, in the form of grace coming by the appointed ministers as by a sort of material channels. The Stuart divines took up the idea, and connected it with Episcopacy. After the Restoration, when Presbyterians and Independents became brothers in adversity, it was gradually obscured. In the practical, common-sense eighteenth century it was almost extinct. In the Episcopal form it has turned up again in our own day. On whatever authority it may rest its claims, it is as certain as any matter of history that it was not the doctrine of the Reformers of the Church of England.

Again, in Dr. Pusey's two favourite doctrines, the

Real Presence in the Eucharist and Baptismal Regeneration, we could show that he is not in agreement with the old Reformed Church of England. Cranmer, while using the strongest language concerning the presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament of the Supper, takes care to explain it as meaning only that the faithful feed upon Christ in the Eucharist in the same way as they feed upon Him in every act of worship. All the Reformers, even Calvin, Bucer, and Peter Martyr, were anxious to retain the rhetorical language of the Fathers concerning this sacrament, and this caused them sometimes to speak as if they really intended a transubstantiation. Then they had to explain themselves by incomprehensible speeches, such as eating a body spiritually, and feeding in the sacrament upon that which is really in heaven. This was not peculiar to the Church of England. It passed into all the Reformed Churches. Even the Westminster Assembly's Confession declares that the body and blood of Christ 'are as really but spiritually present to the faith of believers in that ordinance as the elements themselves are to their outward senses.' Clear-headed men, like John Hales of Eton and Ralph Cudworth, rejected this way of speaking as bordering upon nonsense. Even Bishop Jewel had light enough to declare that the only use of the Supper was a commemoration of Christ's death, and that all other uses are abuses. But, while the language remained in the formularies, it is not remarkable that some took it literally. It suited the Stuart divines when they tried to convert the Reformed Church of England

into a 'Catholic' Church. They talked about altars and sacrifices, but it was a long time before they knew what they had to sacrifice. Andrewes and Buckeridge gave the grotesque explanation that we offer on the altar the elect or mystical Church, which is the body of Christ.

The language of the Baptismal service had a like origin. Calvinistic Reformers retained it, but in connection with their doctrine of absolute predestination. It is found in all the Reformed Confessions as strongly as in our Prayer-Book. It really meant that every elect child was regenerated in baptism. But as no man could distinguish which children were elect, and which were not, it was charitably supposed that all were regenerated. This is the only explanation which a Calvinist could put on it if he believed the regeneration to be actual. And it is the interpretation which the Calvinist divines of that age did put upon it. Hooker, speaking of baptism in connection with predestination, says, that 'all do not receive the grace of the sacrament who receive the sacrament.' It is remarkable that, at the Savoy Conference, the Puritans did not object to the baptismal regeneration of the Baptismal service. They asked that the words 'remission of sins by spiritual regeneration' might be changed into 'may be regenerated and receive remission of sins.' This was asked, not because they objected to the doctrine, but because the words seem to confound remission of sins with regeneration. We have as little desire as Dr. Pusey can have to be bound by the meaning of the service as understood by the 'Calvinistic prelates,' who made it part of the

Prayer-Book ; and while the words are there, we are not surprised that some persons will take them literally. They are fairly capable of Dr. Pusey's interpretation, but it will do no harm to remember the truth and the whole truth concerning their history.

But the greatest of all difficulties in the way of reunion between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, are the two latest Roman dogmas. The infallibility of the Pope, if not already proclaimed, will be, it is generally believed, before many days. This must put an end to all hopes of the reunion of England in any other way than by penance and absolution. If the Pope is infallible, England is in the fearful pit of heresy and schism. The Immaculate Conception of the mother of Jesus has been a dogma since 1854. This is the great *cruz* to Anglicans. The Protestant doctrine that Christ alone is without sin, and that He alone is the Mediator, displaced the worship of the Virgin in all Protestant countries. In the Church of England there is not a vestige of it to be found. Mary is no more worshipped than any other holy matron. It is peculiarly the doctrine of English Christians that 'Jesus is all.' In Him they see supremely all that in man is great and noble, all that in woman is pure and gentle. The first thing that strikes and repels a Protestant when he goes into a Roman Catholic Church, is the supremacy that seems everywhere given to Mary.

Apart from the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, there is a *cultus* which has grown wild and luxuriant, sometimes checked by the authorities, and

sometimes encouraged, as the devotion best suited to certain classes of people. The account which Dr. Pusey gives of the extent of Mary-worship in some Roman Catholic countries, is a very sad one. The passages he quotes 'from Roman Catholic authors, some authorised and some not,' drew even from Dr. Newman the confession that he read them with sorrow and anger. Dr. Pusey shows that Roman Catholics pray to Mary to have remission of sins, to be led into the way of truth; to have grace, life, and glory. Catholicism, it is said, does not flourish in England, because English Catholics do not give sufficient worship to Mary. 'Here in England,' says a pious Roman Catholic writer, 'Mary is not half enough preached: devotion to her is low and thin. It is frightened out of its wits by the sneers of heresy. It is always inviting human respect and carnal prudence, wishing to make Mary so little of a Mary, that Protestants may feel at ease about her. Jesus is obscured, because Mary is kept in the back-ground. *Thousands of souls perish because Mary is withheld from them.*' Italian priests have lamented by the death-beds of their English converts, that they were but half converted, for when dying they put their trust in Jesus, and never uttered a prayer to Mary. Dr. Pusey has often been told that before he can expect to be converted he must learn to pray to Mary. In the Church of Rome, Mary is all in all. She is the 'Queen of heaven, and Mistress of the world,' 'the Great One Herself,' 'the Holy Mother of God,' 'Companion of the Redeemer,' 'Co-redemptress,' 'Authoress of eternal salvation,' 'the Destroyer of heresies through-

out the world,' 'the Ring in the chain of creatures,' 'the Mediatress not of men only, but of angels,' 'the Complement of the Trinity.' One Catholic writer says, that in the Eucharist they eat and drink not only the flesh and blood of Christ, but the flesh and blood of the virgin Mary, and that there is present in the sacrament, not only the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, but also the virgin milk of His virgin mother. Another writer says that the regenerate are born not of flesh, nor of blood, nor of the will of man, but of God *and Mary*.

It is sometimes very provoking to have the plain truth told. Of course this well-evidenced charge of Mariolatry implied that 'the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their manner of living and ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.' Dr. Pusey's proposals for reunion were met with a howl of indignation. The authorities at Rome put his book in the Index of books forbidden, along with two others which, Dr. Pusey says, contain 'blasphemies against our Lord's All-Holiness.' The Church of Rome crucified Dr. Pusey, nailing him to the back of the door of St. Peter's along with two malefactors, who only received the just reward of their deeds. Dr. Pusey did not relish the society of his two companions in tribulation. He did not see that 'Ecce Homo' was really an 'Eirenicon,' that its brilliant pages portrayed the human life of Him who even in His humanity was divine, and thereby drew all men unto Him. And did not the other book also speak peace? Was it not an Eirenicon, and with no 'sword wreathed in myrtle?' Did it not appeal to the Catholic reason

of mankind to find in that reason a basis for the essential doctrines of the religion of Jesus Christ, and so to unite all men into one Church wide as the human race, and Catholic as God's universe? The *Dublin Review* complains that there are some things which they 'cannot hammer into Dr. Pusey's head.'*

Of the two great parties into which the Church of Rome is divided it was from one only that Dr. Pusey could expect even a patient hearing, and that party is not the one which rules the Church of Rome. It only exists on sufferance. Taking it as represented by such Catholics as Dr. Döllinger there is scarcely a doctrine or ceremony on which they could not come easily to at least a temporary agreement with Dr. Pusey. But they meet each other only by accident. Like travellers lodging at the 'Three Taverns,' they are within a day's journey of Rome. But while Dr. Pusey has set his face as if he would go to the great city, Dr. Döllinger and his friends have been there already, and have no wish to return. To them it is not like

'A little heaven below.'

The intimate relations that have long existed between Dr. Pusey and Dr. Newman give a peculiar human interest to this controversy. We say controversy, for such it has really become. Dr. Newman's conversion to Roman Catholicism will never have any other significance than that of a curious study for the psychologist. A great reasoner adopts some principles

* In the *Essays on Reunion* Dr. Pusey complains bitterly of the treatment he had received at Rome. He adds afterwards, in a note, that he has received reliable information that his book escaped the Index.

which have no foundation in reason. He reasons upon them till he becomes troubled with the incongruities between his reason and what he believes. To get peace and to *save his soul* he at last abandons reason, and clings only to authority. He wants to be delivered from the responsibility of reason. So he joins the Church of Rome because it makes the oldest and boldest claim to speak infallibly in the name of God. There is an acknowledged principle in physiology that a well-developed organ often has its strength at the expense of some other organ or organs. The same principle is probably applicable to the faculties of the mind, and explains the co-existence of strength and weakness in the same man. Dr. Newman actually speaks of 'saving his soul' by leaving the Church of England for the Church of Rome, and the principle is the one of being on the safe side after a reckoning of probabilities. The turning-point of the conversion of this great master of reasoning was a rhetorical sentence in the very illogical St. Augustine. 'Securus judicat orbis terrarum!' cried the Bishop of Hippo, in his controversy with the Donatists. The world must be right against a sect that exists only in the north of Africa. The world must be right, echoed Dr. Newman, against Anglicans who exist only in England. It is always an argument that a man is in the wrong when the whole world is against him. But what was St. Augustine's 'orbis terrarum?' The great saint really believed that the Roman empire embraced the world, and that the whole world was converted to Christianity. What was Dr. Newman's world whose universal judgment

was to overrule his reason? It was not the eight or nine hundred millions that people the globe. It was not the judgment of the wise men of all ages which he sought. It was not even the judgment of the learned men of Europe. It was only, we may say, the judgment of the Council of Trent received by Roman Catholics, not as the conclusion of their reason, but as the evidence of their submission to the authority of a Church.

Dr. Pusey's first letter to Newman, which we take to form Part II. of the 'Eirenicon,' is entirely devoted to the Immaculate Conception. This was the subject on which Dr. Newman had undertaken to enlighten his 'dear Pusey,' whom he congratulates with a superb piece of the most delicate sarcasm on his seeing his way to lay down definite proposals as a basis of corporate reunion. Dr. Pusey is here told that the Church of England is fundamentally in error, and that he must come to the Catholic Church in the spirit of obedience, not reserving to himself so much private judgment as whether or not he shall kiss a crucifix. Immaculate conception is explained as simply meaning that, from the first moment of her existence, Mary had a superadded fulness of grace, which put her in a state of innocence corresponding to that of Eve. St. Augustine explained original sin as birth by concupiscence. And in this sense Mary was not without it. Her birth was not supernatural, like that of Jesus. But she had supernatural graces added. She did not fall, as Eve did, but merited to become the mother of the Redeemer. In this sense, she too is a Saviour. Dr. Newman justified to a great extent

the popular Mariolatry. The silly things which devout people say in their devotions to Mary are compared to the silly things that fall from lovers' lips, to be whispered only in lovers' ears. Dr. Pusey naturally asks the question, If this worship of Mary was in the primitive Church? He applies the old rule of Catholicism, laid down by Vincentius Lirinensis—'What was believed by all, always, and everywhere.' Dr. Newman answers from his theory of 'Development,' that it existed in germ. Mr. Harper illustrates the process by development in nature. We do not look for vertebrates in the earliest geological strata; yet we find germs or rudiments of the organisms that now exist. This means, we imagine, that if Mr. Darwin had proved that men are developed from fishes, it would therefore be right to say that fishes are men, because men are developed from fishes. In this way the continuity of 'Catholic truth' is preserved.

The passages which Dr. Newman quotes from the Fathers in support of Mary-worship are such as the words of St. Jerome,—'Death by Eve, life by Mary,' or this of Tertullian, Mary 'blotted out' Eve's fault, and brought back 'the female sex,' or 'the human race' to salvation. The old Fathers had a great fondness for contrasts. St. Paul's illustration of the first and second man may have suggested that of the first and second woman. The language, indeed, of the Fathers is not to be justified, but it is unfair to take their fanciful parallels, and convert them into doctrines. If this were done only by Roman Catholics we might have a word to say for Dr. Pusey; but Dr. New-

man argues, we think justly, that from Dr. Pusey's own doctrine concerning the mother of Jesus, he ought not to be offended by some of the titles used in the Church of Rome. Dr. Pusey delights to call Mary the 'Mother of God.' This is a title which to modern ears sounds like blasphemy. Taken literally, it is destructive of the 'Catholic faith,' for even the creed of St. Athanasius does not say that the man Jesus was God, but expressly the contrary, that He was 'man, of the substance of His mother.' A General Council decreed that Mary was Theotocos Deipara, or Mother of God. It must then be received as an article of the faith by all who believe in the infallibility of Councils. It originated in the fond fancies of such Fathers as St. Ignatius, who says 'Our God was carried in the womb of Mary,' and of St. Chrysostom, who speaks of the 'everlasting' as born of a woman. It is continued by Dr. Newman, who does not scruple to say that 'Mary bore, suckled, and handled the Eternal.' Even with Dr. Pusey she is 'Our Lady.'

'Eirenicon,' Part III., or the second letter to Dr. Newman, is a defence of the original positions of the 'Eirenicon.' It still maintains that reunion is possible if we can treat with the Church of Rome on the Gallican principles as expounded by Bossuet. This leads Dr. Pusey to repeat the well-known arguments and facts against Papal infallibility. But the repetition of them is an offence to the very party which rules the Church of Rome.

For the spirit and claims of that party we must turn to Dr. Manning's Pastoral. Some Roman Catholics and some Anglo-Catholics had formed an association,

and agreed to pray together for the reunion of Christendom. The Roman Catholic bishops in England submitted the constitution of the 'association' to the judgment of the 'Congregation of the Holy Office' at Rome. The association was condemned, and Catholics were forbidden to pray with Anglicans for any such object. The grounds of the condemnation involved the condemnation of the principles on which the Anglicans proposed reunion. The 'Congregation' said that there were not three Churches of Christ—the Greek, the Roman, and the Anglican—but only one Church, which was that of Rome. Christ's Church had never lost its unity, and never could lose it. Under pain of eternal death, it was declared to be the duty of every man to enter the only Church of Christ, which was that presided over by the Bishop of Rome. Dr. Manning described the scheme of union as based, not on the Thirty-nine Articles as understood by Englishmen, nor on the Council of Trent as understood by Catholics, but in a sense known neither to the Church of England nor the Church of Rome. He declares it to be as impossible to be saved out of the 'one fold,' which is that of Rome, as it is to be regenerated without baptism. The Church of England is the 'Anglican separation,' the Greek Church is the 'Greek schism.' To call these Churches parts of the Church Catholic is to destroy the boundaries of truth and falsehood. If these Churches are Catholic, then the infallibility and œcumenicity of Trent must be denied. Dr. Manning says that if Anglicans appeal to Bossuet, they must believe with Bossuet. The infallibility of the Pope may be denied, but there

remains the infallibility of the Church. Bossuet lived in Catholic unity, Anglicans are in separation. It is not enough to accept the decrees of Trent because we agree with them. This is mere private judgment. They must be accepted because the Council spoke with authority. To decide, because of evidence, to agree with the Church in doctrine, through an exercise of private judgment, does not make a man a Catholic. That requires submission and obedience. It is the Church which interprets both antiquity and the Scriptures. Its office is to assert, not to argue; to declare, not to give reasons. It is no sign of humility, Dr. Manning says, and no evidence of faith, to appeal from the Pope to a General Council of Greeks, Anglicans, and Romans, who shall put down Ultramontanism, declare the Pope fallible, and restore the Immaculate Conception to the region of pious opinions. True faith is obedience to the Church of Rome; 'other foundation can no man lay.'

Of the same tone and character is Mr. Harper's elaborate work, 'Peace through the Truth.' The Church, that is, the Church of Rome, is the visible kingdom of Christ, 'His Incarnation.' It is a supernatural institution, and lives a supernatural life. A religious society, like the Church of England, outside of the 'true Church,' has no rights. The question is between 'the Incarnate Word' and 'a body of men.' To say that the Church has erred for twelve centuries is to say that the Holy Ghost has failed in His mission. The Church being, as it were, the body of Christ, not by a figure, but in reality, from Him, through the hierarchy, flows a never-

ceasing stream of supernatural grace; but it flows only through those in union with the body. The Anglican priesthood are, therefore, but 'high and dry' channels, without even a globule of sacramental grace. In Dr. Pusey's objections to the extravagances of Roman devotion Mr. Harper only sees hatred to the practical life of the Church. The 'dominant errors,' against which Dr. Newman said our Articles were chiefly directed, are regarded as the 'perfected consciousness' of the Church. It cannot, we think, be denied that Mr. Harper has here caught the spirit by which the Church of Rome lives. This accords with the claims of an infallible Church. The consistency of the ideal is preserved. Our Reformers agreed with Mr. Harper that the popular superstitions were a part of the consciousness of the Church of Rome, and just on that account they did not trouble themselves to distinguish between authorised dogma and what was commonly believed. And this is really the vital question. It is not whether a harmony can be effected between the creeds of the two Churches, but whether the two Churches can have one life, one consciousness. All Protestants have felt instinctively, as Mr. Harper feels, that between the Church of England and the Church of Rome there is 'a great gulf.' On which side are the companions of Dives or Lazarus will be a matter of difference. But Mr. Harper is consistent with himself when he says, that but for the Reformation in England 'thousands now in hell might have been eternally saved.' He denies that there is one well-authenticated case of a Pope falling into error. The Anglican doctrine of the 'Real Presence,' even as

explained by Dr. Pusey, is declared to be in direct contradiction to that of the Council of Trent, while the history of the 'Black Rubric' determines, with historical certainty, that Dr. Pusey's doctrine is not that of the Church of England. Mr. Harper announces a 'Second Series' of Essays, and Dr. Pusey advertises a reply to Mr Harper.

Of all the answers to Dr. Pusey, we know of none to be compared with that in the *Revue du Monde Catholique*. It consists of three articles by a Jesuit Father, written with a fascinating precision, with a penetrating insight into the minutest bearings of the question, and with a delicate raillery worthy of the happiest moments of Voltaire. The literary and theological value of the 'Eirenicon' is estimated at about nothing. The arguments are simply those advanced thirty years ago by Father Newman, and by the same Father afterwards solidly refuted. The Anglicans reject the name of Protestant, and take upon them that of Anglo-Catholics, 'or even Catholics.' Of all the Protestant sects the Anglican is the most inconsequent, precisely because it is that which has preserved most Catholic truth while revolting against the Catholic Church. It professes to follow antiquity, and yet there is nothing in antiquity more clearly proclaimed by the first Councils, or more energetically demonstrated by the Fathers, than the supremacy of the Roman See. When Cardinal Wiseman got the Anglicans upon antiquity, he crushed them under the weight of decisive texts. Anglicans rest upon Episcopacy because of the privileges which the Fathers say are possessed by the bishops; but these same Fathers show that the first

condition of enjoying these privileges is legitimate appointment. Catholics have always denied the validity of the consecration of the Anglican bishops under Elizabeth. With only one exception they had all been violently introduced into their sees by the royal authority, and contrary to the holy canons. From the Fathers the Anglicans learned some vague ideas about the necessity of the unity of the Church. On the strength of this they pronounced a severe sentence against the Dissenters. They even called John Wesley a heresiarch. More than that, their simplicity was such that they charged Catholics with quitting the great unity of the Christian world. Anglicans saw the necessity of an authority, but they could not determine where it was to be found. Article XX. gives the Church a right to propose decisions, but not to impose them. The Church has some authority in appearance, but none in reality.

To make Dr. Pusey a Catholic one thing is lacking. Without that one thing he will be a Protestant all the days of his life. He wants that which in itself constitutes orthodoxy. He wants *submission to the authority of the Church*. He must believe the doctrines of the Church, not because of their agreement with Scripture and tradition, but because the Church declares them. It is true he believes the Church, but then it is the Church of another age—a Church which speaks by documents of which Dr. Pusey remains the sole judge. Like other Protestants, he still exercises his private judgment. The only difference is that they interpret the Bible only, while Dr. Pusey interprets decrees of Councils and writings of Fathers. But in

both cases there is private judgment and an equal absence of true faith, which is submission.

The Church of the first centuries was infallible, according to Dr. Pusey. That is to say, Christ's promise to His Church was only kept till the Church was invaded by heresy and schism. The guides of the Church now are to be the writings of the Fathers. But does Dr. Pusey know the meaning of the Fathers? Their writings may be understood in many senses. Moreover, if Christianity can only be learned from the Fathers, what is to become of the multitude of people who have no time to read either Fathers or decrees of Councils? Did Jesus Christ place His truth within the reach of Oxford doctors only, and not also of infants and little children? There is nothing, the French writer says, peaceful in Dr. Pusey's book except its title. It is a 'sad book.' It proposes to unite 'Anglicans' and 'Catholics,' by converting both into 'Puseyites.'

The Reunion Essays, published by Mr. Hayes, are in their way curiosities. We might have given the volume a word of commendation, but for the utter inanity of three or four of the essays about the middle and towards the end of the book. One writer proposes nothing less than to *un-Protestantize* and to *Catholicize* England. Another speaks of the restoration of the 'Daily Sacrifice.' One charges the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge with 'an overt act of heresy,' in striking out of all its books, at the instigation of a late Archbishop of Canterbury, without a protest from a single bishop, the expression 'Mother of God.' Another bemoans the infidelity of the age,

which has almost ceased to believe that there is 'material fire' in hell. But the gem of the collection is the Essay by 'A Priest of the Archdiocese of Constantinople,' who tells the Anglicans, in the spirit of Mr. Harper, that they and the Roman Catholics 'must hear the words of truthful warning from the unvarying lips of orthodoxy;' that 'the truth which the orthodox hold must be affirmed' by all, and that 'orthodoxy is ready and willing to explain when the uninformed are prepared to be taught.'

With the Greek Church reunion is more probable than with the Roman; but the great interest of the question turns on the relation of Rome to separated or national Churches. The claim which Rome makes is peculiar, and as generations pass, that claim is increasingly urged. The events of the passing hour take away all hope that those who rule the Church of Rome will ever make even a sign to Dr. Pusey and his friends, till, on bended knees, they receive from the 'Holy Father' that blessing which will purify them from the birth-sin of heresy. Nor in one sense do we blame Rome. If it really is what it professes to be, it is right in making no surrender. But, on the other hand, if it is not what it professes to be, then Protestants are justified in the severest things that they have said against it. If Mr. Harper's view of the Church of Rome really is the correct one, it either is what he calls it, an 'incarnation of Christ,' or it is Antichrist. In the latter case the claim to infallibility will be its destruction, and Protestants may say, 'Ephraim is joined to his idols, let him alone.'

We might urge this on 'Anglo-Catholics,' but we

are too conscious that their position is not one reached by reason. It is simply due to a certain tendency of mind. The same men who are 'Anglo-Catholics' in the Church of England would be Ultramontanes in the Church of Rome. There are two tendencies in all Churches. One is the disposition to rely on authority; the other is to mental independence. We sometimes see Roman Catholics claiming the right to reason for themselves, and Protestants rejoicing in the renunciation of reason. Dr. Pusey, in the nineteenth century, still looks for grace coming through a hierarchy, as through a material channel. Bishop Jewel, three centuries ago, was able to say that Divine grace is not given to sees and successions, but to them that fear God.

V.

DEAN STANLEY'S ESSAYS ON CHURCH AND
STATE.*

JULIUS HARE used to say, 'Children always turn to the light; Oh, that grown-up men would do likewise!' If we were to attempt a description of Dean Stanley's characteristics, we should name first, and chief of all, his intense love for the light. His is not the half-despairing cry of Goethe for 'more light,' but the happy radiant hopefulness of the child, whose great joy is 'to go out and see the sun.' He opens every door and window to let in the light. He is all eye and all ear, quick to receive all knowledge from whatever quarter it comes. He has learned to

'Seize upon truth where'er 'tis found,
On Christian or on heathen ground.'

His 'Essays on Church and State' might be called the epic of 'the Thirty Years' War' in the Church of England. The subject is the three great battles which each party in the Church has had to fight to maintain its existence. Other subjects, collateral and subsidiary, are discussed as occasion offers, coming in, as it were,

* Contemporary Review, September, 1870.
Essays on Church and State. By A. P. STANLEY, D.D. London: John Murray. 1870.

'by way of episode.' The lesson or moral of the whole is that the three parties are to tolerate each other, and to continue the union of Church and State because that union softens the bitterness of party feeling, controls the fierce spirit of ecclesiasticism, and prevents the Church being cut off from the Divine progress of the world.

The first Essay in the volume is on the Gorham Controversy. It was published twenty years ago in the *Edinburgh Review*. We have not at present any intention of tracing the history of the rise of modern High Churchism. We shall really avoid the usual platitudes about the 'godless' eighteenth century. We shall not speak of the 'frost' under Bishop Butler, and the 'thaw' under Dr. Pusey. The complacency with which some men in our time condemn the last century is amusing. The common denunciation of the immorality of our grandfathers and great-grandfathers implies a tolerably well-satisfied opinion of our own progress. To connect the Oxford movement with the repose of the last century is to trace the Trojan War to Leda's eggs; and in both cases the amount of fable is about equal.

We start with the well-known fact, that in the fifth decade of the present century the High Church party thought they had sufficient strength to thrust the 'Evangelicals' out of the Church of England. The decisive battle was fought between the Bishop of Exeter and Mr. Gorham. The subject of their difference was of significance only as it indicated the different tendencies of the two parties represented by the Bishop and the Presbyter. Dr. Philpotts said

that every baptized child was 'regenerated' by the act of baptism. Mr. Gorham denied that by that act a baptized child was necessarily 'regenerated.' The judgment was against the bishop. It declared Mr. Gorham's doctrine tenable in the Church of England, and compatible with a fair interpretation of the formularies. This judgment Dean Stanley receives as the charter of our ecclesiastical liberty, the legal authorisation of differing dogmas in the Church.

A great part of the baptismal controversy is manifestly a mere battle about a word. The most zealous advocates of baptismal regeneration differ among themselves as to what 'regeneration' means. With some it is an actual sanctification of the baptized. With others it is merely fœderal, signifying nothing more than admission into the Christian covenant. The battle was fought on the question of regeneration in baptism, but the real conflict was between the theological system of Calvin and that of High Churchmen, who combine with the theology of Arminius the claims of a hierarchy. We are not sure that we agree with Dean Stanley when he quotes and endorses the words of Bishop Horsley, that on the points of difference between the followers of Calvin and their opponents 'the Church of England maintains an absolute neutrality.' In one place the Dean says that no Puritan would have written the baptismal service. This is probably true, yet we have not read that the Puritans ever raised any special objection to this service. If by Puritan Dean Stanley means simply a Calvinist, we differ from him altogether. It might have been written by any of the Reformers of Calvin's

school. The same mode of speaking of baptism is found in the Calvinistic Confessions of the Reformed Churches. But, on the other hand, no Arminian could have written Article XVII. We try in vain to conceive of this Article as existing in a Wesleyan Confession of Faith. Moreover, the whole spirit, tone, and phraseology of the Thirty-nine Articles is Calvinistic. Calvin or his great ancestor, Augustine, turns up everywhere with a perversity and a pertinacity that are sometimes provoking. The only arguments ever advanced against the Calvinism of the Thirty-nine Articles are the two feeble pleas put forward by Archbishop Laurence. The first is that the Articles were compiled from the Augsburg Confession, which is simply begging the question that on these subjects the German Reformers did not agree with Calvin. The second argument is derived from the rejection of the Lambeth Articles. But any one who reads the only authentic account which we have of the Hampton Court Conference will find it plainly stated that the Lambeth Articles were not rejected because they differed from the Thirty-nine, but simply because there was no necessity for them. King James, who decided on their rejection, was himself at that time a strong Calvinist, and the compiler of the Lambeth Articles, Archbishop Whitgift, was a member of the Conference, and the chief supporter of the king. In evidence of the Calvinistic character of the Reformed Church of England we have the theological literature of three generations after the Reformation, forming a 'consentient voice' of the Church for seventy years, testifying to the dominion of the theology of Calvin.

It may be urged that the moderation of the Articles contrasts with the pronounced Calvinism of the Westminster Confession. But the difference is in degree, not in kind. It is easy to account for the more systematic statements of doctrine coming after the great controversy on the five points in the beginning of the reign of the first Charles.

The issue which was raised in the Gorham prosecution was not the admissibility of Calvinism in the Church of England. That had been admitted since the Reformation. Mr. Gorham had on his side the Calvinistic Reformers and their successors, who believed that baptism conveyed regeneration to elect children. But as these were known only to God, the visible Church charitably assumed that all baptized children were among the elect, and, therefore, regenerate. The only foundation which Dr. Philpotts had for his doctrine was by taking literally, in the baptismal service for children, the words which in the service for the baptism of adults, he explained as Mr. Gorham did.

In denying the neutrality of the Church of England as to the doctrines of Calvin, we at the same time fail to discover any ground for ascribing to our Reformers the principle of compromise or comprehension. It is possible that the Dean of Westminster only means that comprehension was the result. We cannot find that it was ever seriously intended, much less openly proposed. In the time of Henry VIII. Cranmer proceeded with caution and prudence, as far as circumstances would permit him. Under Edward his action was more decided. If we reckon the Puritan party

to have then existed, and to have been represented by such men as Hooper and Coverdale, there was great freedom in that direction. But this reign was short and unsettled. Between Elizabeth and her first bishops there was something like compromise. The bishops conformed to rituals and ceremonies which they would gladly have laid aside. For some years the Queen was allowed to have a crucifix in her chapel, though not without some bitter complaining. For the first five years of her reign the Puritans had great freedom as to the ceremonies. Then began subscriptions and the enforcing of uniformity. The principle of exclusion contended with the fact of comprehension. The same influences that exist to-day were at work then. A Broad Church was the result obtained, but until Dean Stanley's time it never was the end proposed.

Ten years after the Gorham prosecution and the cry of war was again raised. The Church of England, in separating from the Church of Rome, appealed to the Scriptures. It retained the three creeds, for the reason assigned, that they could be proved by 'most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.' An appeal to the Scriptures, explain it as we may, is an appeal to reason. It throws men back at once upon questions concerning the authenticity, history, authority, and interpretation of the Scriptures. The inquiry at every step implies the supremacy of reason. There was not probably either in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries one single theologian who carried out this principle to its ultimate and logical results. It was largely developed in Hooker; but he is confused and

contradictory when he speaks of the province of reason in religion. Chillingworth went further, and was clearer; but he did not touch the goal. The exigencies of his argument did not require him to go beyond the position, that to start with an infallible Bible was as rational as to start with an infallible Church. The claims of reason were acknowledged more openly by the Cambridge Platonists and by the theologians of the eighteenth century, yet in every case with certain limits. The discoveries in science and the progress in the study and criticism of the Scriptures that have been made in our day, demanded that a further step should be made in the direction of reason. This was done in 1860 in the famous 'Essays and Reviews.' The 'religious world,' unprepared, as it too often is, for a change in theology, gasped with horror. The seven writers were seven Antichrists of the latter day. High Churchmen and Low Churchmen stood appalled. Their hearts failed them for fear. Dr. Pusey grasped the hand of the editor of the *Record*. Each felt that a brother is born for adversity. An enemy had arisen, whose existence demanded the cessation of all former hostilities. From that day Herod and Pontius Pilate were friends.

Dean Stanley's estimate of 'Essays and Reviews' is, in the main, just. It was not the best exposition either of the principles or the spirit of the Broad Church party. It took away, without always showing what was to be given in the place of what was taken away. It was not a book for the general public. Its authors, indeed, did not intend that it should be. They wrote for scholars; in fact, they wrote for the

clergy, and for them it was a book seasonable, salutary, and necessary. Two of the writers were prosecuted in the Ecclesiastical Courts. Out of thirty-two charges they were condemned on five, in the Court of Arches. They appealed to the Privy Council. Of the five remaining charges, two were withdrawn by the prosecutors. The three that were left were the denial of the inspiration of the Scriptures, eternal punishment, and justification by faith. In the defence it was urged that the inspiration of the Scriptures was not denied. It was only made the same in kind with that which guides the Church and purifies the hearts of the faithful. Eternal punishment was not in strict language denied. There was simply a hope expressed, that in some way unknown to us, all men might be ultimately saved. Justification by faith was not denied, but only the 'fiction of a transfer of merit,' or what in technical theological language is called the 'imputation of Christ's righteousness.' On these three charges the two essayists were acquitted. There is no formulary of the Church of England in which inspiration is defined. There is no article which forbids us to hope for the final restoration of all men. There is an article which defines justification by faith; but there is no mention of the imputation of Christ's righteousness. On all these questions we regard it as certain that the compilers of the Articles believed the opposite of what the essayists believed, and that they would have agreed entirely with the prosecutors. But this belief is not expressed in the formularies of the Church, and so the position of the Broad Church party was legally established.

Several of the men who wrote against the essayists rapidly rose to high places in the Church. The essayists themselves were left without further preferment. The sole exception was that of Mr. Pattison, who was appointed Rector of Lincoln, but against whose essay no one had anything special to say. Dr. Williams spent the remaining years of his too short life in the congenial work of a country clergyman, among his parishioners of Broad Chalke. Mr. Wilson was left in his quiet parsonage of Great Staughton—a voice, it may be, in the wilderness, but a terror to the surrounding clergy, and a beacon-light to warn all men of the danger of ‘free-handling’ the Scriptures. Mr. Jowett, whose essay was the glory of the volume, is still Greek Professor at Oxford.* In those days he taught Greek for nothing. It was proposed to endow his professorship; but that burning zeal for the ‘faith’ which rarely fails the country clergy, brought them in such numbers to Oxford, that they outvoted the promoters of the endowment. Had it not been for the wisdom of the Lord Chancellor in connecting a canonry with the professorship, Mr. Jowett might to this hour have been teaching Greek for nothing. Ten years had nearly passed before a Prime Minister had the courage and decision to elevate one of the essayists to the Bench of Bishops. This was done amid the howlings and wailings of High Churchmen and Low Churchmen; but it was done. The fact is accomplished. The editor and prime author of ‘Essays and Reviews’ is Bishop of Exeter.

* He has since been made Master of Balliol.

We do not know that Dr. Temple has in any way renounced his connection with the liberal party in the Church since his elevation to the see of Exeter. He has withdrawn his essay, which in one sense we regret. Yet there is something which all men owe to the consciences of them that are weak. Dean Stanley reduces the doctrine of Bishop Temple's essay to the level of the most ordinary theological truism. He makes it simply St. Paul's doctrine that the advent took place 'in the fulness of time;' in Dr. Temple's words, 'at the time most fitted for the production of the effect intended.' The 'education of the human race' we always understood as meaning this certainly, but also more than this. In our judgment it made heathen wisdom part of the Divine teaching, thus extending the idea of inspiration beyond the circle of the Jewish nation and the Christian Church. In other words, it made the world potentially the Church, not limiting 'revelation' to what was contained in the canonical Scriptures. To be in harmony with the rest of the volume, the essay on 'The Education of the Human Race,' required this meaning. In the current number of the *Westminster Review*, it is said that Dr. Temple never understood his own doctrine, for to the 'education' he adds 'revelation' as the necessary complement.* It is true that in all these questions we are ever at the mercy of words. St. Paul, speaking in the Epistle to the Romans of the wisdom of the Greek philosophers, distinctly says, 'God *manifested* it to them.' Yet, conventionally, we call that only revela-

* In a review of 'Religious Thought in England.'

tion which we learn from the Scriptures; and, as Father Malebranche says, we 'ungratefully' ascribe all other knowledge to our own understandings.

One of the essayists, the lamented Baden Powell, had passed into the unseen world before the 'Essays and Reviews' were published. His essay, more than any of the others, required explanation. On the relations of faith and reason he is beyond measure confused, relegating revelation entirely to faith, and in words which remind us of Voltaire's sneering *persiflage* concerning the virtue of 'believing.' Yet Voltaire only repeated the words of the orthodox concerning faith; and there is every ground for believing that, in placing revelation beyond the province of reason, Baden Powell was perfectly sincere. We rather marvel at the caution with which the Dean of Westminster defends the memory of the Savilian professor. He had been denounced as a hopeless infidel and a confirmed atheist. It was publicly stated in support of these charges that he died without any ministrations of religion. Dean Stanley answers that his death was sudden, and, like all sudden deaths, it was without religious or other ministrations. But within a few days of his last illness he preached, worshipped, and communicated as usual at St. Andrew's, Well Street, the church which he usually attended. In the very year in which he died he asked permission to deliver the Bampton Lectures. So far the Dean's defence. We are disposed to go much farther. We have read with some care all that Baden Powell wrote. On many questions in theology his views were imperfect; yet in that department which was peculiarly his own,

the scientific side of religion, we think that no man in this century has done more to clear, to establish, and to strengthen the argument for theism drawn from the manifestations of order and intelligence in the natural world.

The only party which has not yet made good its position in the Church of England is the High Church party. It was put on its defence in the Denison prosecution, but that broke down on some technical point. It is now on its trial in the prosecution of Mr. Bennett. When we speak of a High Church party we must again bear in mind the inadequateness of language, and especially of terms which are used to class and label religious parties. There are different kinds of High Churchmen, some of them exceedingly unlike each other. In the seventeenth century the High Churchmen were the men of culture, the scholars of the age, liberal and tolerant of everything except the scruples of Puritanism, which sorely tried their patience. After the Revolution the High Churchmen were generally the country clergy, whose great warfare was not with the flesh and the devil, but with Latitudinarian bishops. In the beginning of the last century all liberal measures passed the Upper House of Convocation, but were condemned in the Lower House. The Wesleys, in the early stages of their career, were High Churchmen; but by High Church zeal they were pelted with brickbats and rotten eggs till the devotion which began in the Church could only find rest in the conventicle. But the old species died out. In their later days they were simply the 'beef-eaters' of the Church. They obeyed its laws. They

defended in their own way its bulwarks. They were great pluralists, the ready servants of the State; but too loyal and too Conservative, both in religion and politics, ever to come into collision with anything the Church taught, or seemed to teach.

The High Churchism of the present day might be regarded as including all opinions—from those of some members of the ‘Evangelical’ party, who have a vague belief in apostolical succession, up to the attitudinarians of the Ritualistic Churches. So long as High Churchmen were moderate, and merely emphasized some acknowledged principles or allowed practices of the Church, they were unmolested. The party was put on its defence when it openly taught doctrines and introduced ceremonies that had been expressly put aside at the Reformation. The one great doctrine at which, beyond all others, our Reformers stumbled was the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation in the Eucharist. Sooner than admit this they went to the stake and the scaffold. A party of High Churchmen are now confessedly teaching the same doctrine in the Church of England under the name of the ‘Real Presence.’ There is a marked difference between the history of the baptismal question and that of the Eucharist. At the Reformation no one objected to baptismal regeneration. It was received, so far as we can learn, by all the Reformers, both at home and abroad. We do not except the Puritans. We are not sure if we can even except the Zwinglians. It was never a subject of controversy between our Reformers and the Church of Rome. But the same cannot be said of the Eucharist. This was

the greatest of their controversies. A few words may be gleaned here and there in the Prayer-Book which seem to savour of the rejected doctrine. But there were Articles written expressly to condemn it; and in the time of Edward a special rubric was added, declaring the impossibility of a body being in two places at the same time, in the very words of John Fryth, who was burned at Smithfield for teaching the doctrine of Zwingle. This rubric was omitted under Elizabeth, and was not re-inserted till after the Savoy Conference. The Puritans asked its restoration. It was restored by the moderate party; not, however, to please Puritans, but as a barrier against the Eucharistic doctrine that had been introduced by Laud. The question, then, of the comprehension of the modern High Churchmen—we mean of the Ritualistic class—is not the same as in the case of the other two parties, who are not touched by the formularies. The objects of the Ritualists is avowedly to override both Articles and Rubrics, to go beyond the Reformation, and, for the teaching of the Reformers, to substitute that of the Church previous to the Reformation.

Dean Stanley wishes to extend the comprehension as far as it can be extended compatible with the safety of the Church. On this ground only can we acquiesce in the recent judgment of Sir R. Phillimore in the case of Mr. Bennett. To give a legal sanction to definite errors which the Articles of the Church definitely condemn, is to disregard the last semblance of that law and order without which the Church cannot exist. The 'Real Presence,' which Mr. Bennett teaches, was not the 'presence' held by the Reformers. They

illustrated their meaning by the sun, which is in the heavens, and yet is present on earth by its light and heat. We do not think the illustration a happy one; nor do we think that Cranmer, Calvin, Bucer, and Peter Martyr were wise in speaking of a presence at all, for this reason, that they did not mean a presence in any definite sense. Still, they did speak of a 'presence,' and therefore Sir R. Phillimore's judgment may be vindicated on the ground of toleration and comprehension. Weak-headed men may be useful under proper guidance. Driven from the Church, and put into the category of martyrs, they might be injurious both to themselves and others. There must, however, be a limit somewhere. Mr. Bennett could not fairly have been acquitted if the words under which the prosecution was instituted had not been withdrawn. He spoke in one of his tracts of 'the real, actual, and visible presence of our Lord upon the altars of our churches,'—language too much, surely, even for a Roman Catholic, and which sounds as if it had been written by a maniac.

All these controversies issue in the practical question of a final judge or arbiter who will draw the lines of comprehension and toleration. The need of a judge whose decisions would be final has created the claims of the Bishop of Rome to infallibility. The want of such a judge among Protestants has given rise to an endless sectarianism. The appeal to Scripture has always turned out to be an appeal to reason, either to the private judgment of the individual to find out the meaning of Scripture, or to the same judgment to find out the meaning which the old Fathers put on the

Scripture. Dean Stanley sees our only hope in a National Church, in which the State will allow all parties as much freedom as may be compatible with safety and unity.

On this unexpected use of the State-Church principle we have already spoken in this Review.* The tide of public opinion, and apparently the whole stream of progress, were flowing in the other direction. At the Reformation the Church of England clung to the civil ruler as its only protector from the tyranny of Rome. The King was Christ's vicar. The Pope was Antichrist. At the Revolution this doctrine was found untenable. The Divine right of kings refuted itself. The second James took the side of 'Antichrist,' and the Church went its own way in giving allegiance to the Prince of Orange. The principle of the old State Church of England died out with the Nonjurors. The Highest Churchmen were then the most consistent State-Churchmen. Now times have changed. It is the High Churchmen who are impatient of the government of the State. It interferes with the development of their idea of a hierarchy. The civil power, represented by the Court of Arches and the Privy Council, is the ultimate judge of the doctrine of the Church.

In discussing the Church and State connection we admit at once that it is not a conclusive argument against it to say that it has been accompanied hitherto with many and great evils. No system is perfect, and

* See an article on 'The Churches of England,' April, 1870, and a notice of Dean Stanley's Essay on 'The Connection of Church and State,' June, 1868.

with great advantages we must expect some evils. There have been eras in our history when the whole tendency of the State connection has been apparently to drive all earnest religion out of the Church, and to uphold all manner of iniquity within. The past may, however, be full of instruction for the future, and that evils have been may be the pledge that they shall not be again. It might, indeed, be argued with some fairness that neither the Nonconformists of 1662 nor the Wesleyans of the last century were driven out by the State. They were the victims of parties stronger than themselves. The sin of the State lay in its indifference; and this, it is to be feared, ever will be its sin. We have seen the end of pluralities, and ere long we may see the end of the sale of presentations. Unfortunately we cannot say of advowsons; and so long as that remains there can be no check on illegal or secret treaties about presentations. We cannot surely be wrong in fixing on the present mode of disposing of benefices as the root-evil of the State Church. Dean Stanley has but little to say even in favour of a disinterested patronage, except that it is preferable to the tumults which accompany popular election. To this he adds the consideration that if the clergy had the election of the bishops, men of liberal tendencies would never be elected to the episcopate. As to the evils of popular elections, they might be very few if definite laws were made by which congregations were to be guided in the choice of ministers. It is here that we come upon the strength and the weakness of the argument for our freedom within the National Church. When a man gets a living,—let it

be by purchase, presentation, or simony,—the power which a bishop has over him is merely in name. The bishop is compelled to institute, and he cannot suspend without an expensive process in law. But a clergyman without a benefice is completely at the mercy of either bishop or incumbent. A few weeks ago, to our knowledge, a clergyman, not unknown as a theological writer, agreed to take charge of a small parish not far from London. After an interview with the bishop, his lordship refused to sanction the agreement made with the rector, and ostensibly for no other reason but that the clergyman was a writer who advocated a theology of which the bishop did not approve.* The clergyman had no redress, no court of appeal. He might have gone to the Prime Minister and complained that an arbitrary and impulsive man had been placed over a great diocese, for the duties of which he evidently wanted capacity. The Prime Minister could only have answered that the appointment was made

* The bishop was the present Bishop of Rochester. The clergyman was curate of the parish of Lambeth. He had gone through the correspondence generally involved in a new engagement, and resigned the curacy which he held. The bishop wished an interview, in order, as he expressed it, 'to make acquaintance.' He asked, among other things, why the curate was leaving a populous parish like Lambeth for a small country parish. The answer was that he had literary work, and could not therefore do the work of a large parish. The bishop asked if he wrote for any reviews or magazines. Several were mentioned, and at last the *Contemporary*. At the mention of this Review the bishop's countenance fell, the nerves in his face visibly quivered, he turned away his head for a few seconds, and then stammered out in confusion, 'You will not do; the parish will not suit you, and you will not suit the parish.' The clergyman remonstrated against being treated in this arbitrary manner, but in vain. 'It is my business,' said the bishop 'to judge what men are suitable for places, and what places are suitable for men.' There are, it is to be hoped, but few bishops in the Church of England who so misunderstand their position as to make so flagrant an abuse of their power. But the case illustrates what a self-willed bishop may do, and how helpless an unbeneficed clergyman is before him.

by his predecessor, for whose acts he was not responsible. We do not find in any of Dean Stanley's arguments that he ever takes into his calculations the fact of the existence of curates. The 'Parvique Cures' are Church animalcules, not to be discerned without a glass that magnifies. This would be pardonable if curates were, as the theory implies, merely apprentices to Church work. But it is different when we know that they are really the working bees of the Church, that their number is more than a third of the whole clergy, and that, on an average, a man is from twelve to fifteen years in orders before he gets a living. Here, then, is the actual price of our freedom—a benefice by purchase, or a quiet tongue in our heads for nearly twenty years of the best part of a man's life. Of course the exceptions are many. Dean Stanley, Bishop Temple, Archbishop Tait, and others whom we could name, were never either purchasers of preferment or subjected to a long and ignominious silence. They began life with the prizes of the public schools and the great Universities, which must ever be beyond the reach of the many, and from their very nature attainable only by a few.

One of the essays in this volume is on Subscription to the Articles, both in the Church and the Universities. It is not proposed to set aside the Church's formularies, but only not to enforce subscription, because that in fact no man now believes every statement of the Articles. Those who enter into the life of the Church, and receive the substance of its teaching, will cling to it voluntarily. Those who do not will drop off. And here we have the Dean's answer

to the *Westminster* and *Quarterly Reviews*, when they urged the moral obligation of the essayists to resign their preferments. There is a spirit of progress at work in all Churches. Where this progress is normal, it implies imperfection in the past. The forms in which religion expresses itself in different eras must be subject to change. The old must ever be giving place to the new. Some dogmas which we should now willingly set aside are the incarnations of the devout feelings of the saints of other days. What a figment to us, as indeed it was to Richard Baxter and John Wesley, is the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness! Yet how precious was the meaning it had to Tobias Crisp and John Saltmarsh, to James Hervey and Augustus Toplady!

The Dean of Westminster has peculiar advantages for the discussion of theological questions, from the variety and the accuracy of his knowledge. He reads all kinds of books. He is not only, as we all know, an eminent classical and Biblical scholar, but he is familiar with all the European languages which possess any literature. He has travelled much, and has had the friendship of the prelates and scholars of the Greek and Roman as well as of the Protestant Churches. To these advantages he has added an appreciative study of all the religious parties at home, and their relations to the State Church. He understands General and Particular Baptists, New Connexion and Association Methodists, New Light and Old Light Seceders, and we verily believe he could distinguish between a Burgher and an Anti-Burgher. This capacity for a wide survey enables him to compare, to

analyze, to trace the working of the same principle under different forms, and to detect inconsistencies, not merely in arguments, but what is of more importance, in tendencies. At the time of the 'Essay and Review' mania, the High Church zeal for everlasting punishment in a material hell was very vehement. In the essays on 'The Church and the World,' the representative High Church volume, Dean Stanley finds a hope expressed that there may be a limit to future punishment. A favourite dogma of the High Church party is that Christ's human nature was so unlike ours that it excluded all imperfections of knowledge. But Dean Stanley finds John Keble singing—

'Was not our Lord a little child,
Taught by degrees to pray,
 By father dear and mother mild
Instructed day by day?'

After the judgment on 'Essays and Reviews,' when it was discovered that the Church of England taught no definite doctrines concerning inspiration or everlasting punishment, Cardinal Wiseman wished to make some capital out of this for the Church of Rome. He called mechanical inspiration and everlasting punishment the 'vital doctrines,' the 'sacred deposit,' committed to his Church. Dean Stanley immediately answered that the Cardinal spoke only as a private theologian, for the Decrees of Trent have made no 'definition of the extent of inspiration or of the limits of the Divine mercy.' In another place, where he is dealing with the Bishop of Capetown's argument for a 'concurrent testimony' of the early Church, the Dean says a 'concurrent testimony' may be found in remote times for

the 'Immaculate Conception,' and certainly for the celibacy of the clergy. The Apostolical canons on which the Bishop of Capetown grounded his judgment against Dr. Colenso, direct that a clergyman who marries after taking orders is to be deposed, and the Council of Nicea enjoins the same punishment for every bishop, presbyter, or deacon who shall be promoted to any higher place in the Church than that which he holds.

The chief significance of Dean Stanley's Essays is that they are a contribution to the new theology, or what he calls the theology of the nineteenth century. The chief objection to this theology is that it is but a stepping-stone to something beyond. We do not know what is to be the next form it will assume. This position is accepted. The old theology posited infallibility, and then reasoned downwards. The new begins with ascertained facts, and builds upon them. The doctrine of progress implies that the full truth is a goal to be reached, and not a point from which we start. The old theology assumed what the Bible ought to be; the new asks what it is. To invent ways for God is one of the failings of the human mind. We are now to begin to learn God's way. Popes, councils, and creed-makers in all ages have spoken as if their 'little systems' embraced the whole of truth. Experience of their failures gives us wisdom. We begin to learn that we are only children in the school of Christ, and that our capacities are but small. We recall the forgotten words of Jesus—His parting words to His disciples, as full of meaning in our day as they were then—'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.'

VI.

SPECULATIVE THEOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIANITY OF CHRIST.*

A GREAT deal has been written during the last thirty years, both in Germany and in England, concerning dogma and its relation to the essence of Christianity. It cannot be said that what has been written is of little value; but no one will affirm that on this subject the last word has been spoken, or is likely to be for some time to come. A glance at the contents of the volumes placed at the head of this paper will show, not merely how widely men differ as to what are Christian dogmas, but even as to the meaning, the importance, and the place of dogma itself.

The question is intimately connected with several

* Contemporary Review, February, 1871.

Present-Day Papers on Prominent Questions in Theology. Edited by the Right Rev. ALEXANDER EWING, D.C.L., Bishop of Argyll and the Isles. First Series. Strahan & Co. 1870.

The Atonement in its Relations to the Covenant, the Priesthood, the Intercession of our Lord. By the Rev. HUGH MARTIN, M.A. James Nisbet & Co. 1870.

The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The Bampton Lectures for 1866. By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, M.A. Rivingtons, 1867.

The Dogmatic Faith. An Inquiry into the Relations subsisting between Revelation and Dogma. The Bampton Lectures for 1867. By EDWARD GARBETT, M.A. Rivingtons. 1867.

Studies of Christianity. By JAMES MARTINEAU. Longmans & Co. 1858.

others. It involves the character of Christianity, the meaning of Revelation, and the functions of the Church. From the stand-point of the Church of Rome, the subject is very simple; as, indeed, all subjects are except that of the Church itself. A dogma with the Church of Rome is an article of belief imposed by authority. It is not necessary that the article be understood, or that there be any evidence of its truth; it is enough that it comes with the authority of the Church. The only ground for an essential difference among Roman Catholics must be concerning this authority—who are they whose decisions constitute the voice of the Church? The distinction between a dogma and a pious opinion is clear and definite in the Church of Rome. The same cannot be said of Protestantism. Three hundred years have passed since the Reformation; but it is only to-day that men are beginning to see the ultimate of the principles which the Reformation involved. Protestants made creeds which consisted of definitions of doctrines; but the only authority claimed for them was the authority of Scripture; which implied either that the framers of the creeds had infallibly interpreted the Scriptures, or that those required to believe the creeds were to judge for themselves.

It is not unnatural that those who have written on dogma should generally begin with an inquiry concerning the meaning of the word. The definition given by Neander is just the opposite of what the word means in the Church of Rome. A dogma, he says, is an opinion—a notion. For this meaning of the word, he quotes Plato and Sextus Empiricus. In

the New Testament, however, he adds that the word never occurs in the sense of a doctrine, but only in that of a statute or decree. Dogma, according to Neander, does not form an original part of Christianity. It is derived and secondary. The essence of Christianity does not consist in a system of ideas, but in a tendency of the inner life. 'The pearl of Christianity is a hidden life in God, consisting neither in dogmas, nor ideas, nor ceremonies.' In this case a history of dogmas would be a history of human opinions, not necessarily true, and very probably untrue. The words of Hagenbach correspond to those of Neander. 'Jesus,' he says, 'was not the author of dogmatic theology, but the author and finisher of our faith; not the founder of a sect, but emphatically the founder of religion, and of the Church.' The Lutheran theologian, Martensen, on the other hand, maintains that a dogma is not an opinion, nor even an ascertained truth, but a truth resting on faith, and 'derived from the authority of the Word and Revelation of God.' This is the old Protestant definition, while Neander and Hagenbach represent the view with which it is in conflict. Mr. Liddon starts with the impossibility of separating between faith and dogma; the latter being simply identical with the thing believed. This is true in itself; but Mr. Liddon's argument is beside the question, which is not the impossibility of separating between religion and theology, but whether any given system of articles to be believed can be proved to have authority. Mr. Garbett, in the main, agrees with Mr. Liddon. He defines dogma as positive truth positively asserted. This, Mr. Garbett says, is

the historical meaning of the word, both among Christians and pagans. 'In Christian philosophy it expresses the theology based on the authority of Scripture and the judgment of the Fathers.'

The question of the etymological or historical meaning of the word might be dismissed. It would be no loss to either side to dispense with the word altogether. Mr. Liddon and Mr. Garbett both mean by dogmas certain things to be believed because of the authority which imposes them. This opens up the real question at issue, which is the character of belief if it depends on authority, and the consequent inquiry who or what that authority is. Neander and Hagenbach are as clear as Mr. Liddon and Mr. Garbett that certain things are believed, but they do not admit that they are presented for our belief in the form of authoritative dogmas.

The Church of Rome, as we have said, takes up a position definite and consistent. It claims to speak infallibly, and therefore to publish doctrines or definitions of doctrines with authority. Mr. Liddon, of course, as a Protestant must take the Scriptures before the Church; but not being willing to be considered altogether a Protestant, he falls back on something which he calls 'the voice of the Catholic Church'—that is, some interpretations of Scripture which he finds, or supposes he finds, in some old creeds or Church Fathers, and which he considers 'authoritative elucidations of Christian doctrine.' We have difficulty in discovering that any authority ever belonged to the Church which does not belong to it now. What Mr. Liddon means by the 'Catholic Church' is not easy

to say. Its relations to the present Church of Rome, or the present Church of England, are difficult to determine. Both these Churches cannot be at one with it, for their dogmas are different. The recent efforts to harmonize their teaching have been made, as we all know, by dissolving the dogmas peculiar to each. The English Church is to renounce its articles, and the Church of Rome the decisions of Trent. Mr. Garbett—faithful to the Protestantism of the Church of England, but unfaithful to the principle of Protestantism—seeks another foundation for the authority of dogma. He divides the theory of dogma into three elements—the Church, the dogma itself or the ‘faith,’ and the Scriptures. The first is the keeper of truth, the second is the truth kept, and the Scriptures the authoritative record. The Scriptures are the criterion or the judge. By them we are to discriminate between a true Church and a false Church; by them we know that the dogmas of the Church of Rome are errors, and that those taught in the articles of the Church of England are *the* truth. This is not enough, Mr. Garbett adds in the spirit of the most innocent orthodoxy, that all the Roman dogmas condemned in our articles, rubrics, canons, and homilies are the ‘dogmas taught by special branches of the Church,’ while the teaching of the articles consists of the ‘dogmas ever held in common by the universal Church.’ Authority, however, in the final analysis of the argument, is only ascribed to the Scriptures, so that this ‘universal Church,’ whatever it may be, and the ‘judgment of the Fathers,’ whatever that may mean, have no validity in making dogma authoritative.

To approach this question somewhat nearer, we may follow Mr. Liddon in his application of the principle of dogma to the subject of his lectures—the Divinity of Jesus Christ. In the sense in which Mr. Liddon understands the divinity of Christ, that divinity is an authoritative dogma. We waive the question whether or not Mr. Liddon's doctrine is that of the ancient Church. By his own confession, it was not that of the ante-Nicene Fathers. At least the forms in which they put their doctrine were not satisfactory. They 'admit a Catholic interpretation, but they do not invite one.' This really means that the ante-Nicene Fathers held the divinity of Christ in a sense which would now be reckoned heresy. We do not know if Mr. Liddon's doctrine is really that of the Nicene Fathers. We seriously question if it be that of St. Athanasius. We have grave doubts if it is even that of the Athanasian Creed. The Church went on defining till the latter definitions converted the earlier doctrines into heresies. This is the conclusion to which we are inevitably led by every history of dogmas. The dogmatist demands that the doctrine be received in its most developed form. The anti-dogmatist prefers it in a simpler form, under which may be included a variety of opinions respecting it. In John's Gospel Jesus speaks of Himself as being one with the Father, and He prays for His disciples that by a like union they might be united to Him, that they all might be one with the Father. Athanasius, in the spirit of John's Gospel, made the incarnation of the Logos in Jesus the same in kind with the incarnation of the Logos in all good men.

The very object of the incarnation, according to St. Athanasius, was that man might be made God. This is far removed from that modern view of the incarnation which isolates the man Jesus from the whole of humanity, as if in Him, under the limitations of the finite, was embraced the all of the Infinite. Exuberance of piety might be pardoned when it speaks of

‘Our God contracted to a span ;’

but when this idea is worked up into a dogma, and called the ‘Catholic’ faith, anti-dogmatists may well long for the simpler creed of the ante-Nicene Fathers, or even that Athanasius would again arise and fight his battles, ‘*contra mundum*,’ against the world of modern dogmas.*

For another phase of the development of dogma we turn to Mr. Hugh Martin. We have designedly chosen an extreme form of Calvinism, and we take a representative of the metaphysical Scotch intellect, the

‘Gens ratione ferox et mentem pasta chimæris.’

The question is, if any of these chimæras be the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Mr. Martin advocates the old Scotch theology in its integrity, the theology of the Westminster Confession of Faith. This Confession is still subscribed by the Presbyterian ministers in Scotland; in charity, we hope, only with explanations and reservations sufficient to neutralise its

* In opposition to the whole of Mr. Liddon’s theory we may quote the words of Lücke: ‘The more I endeavour to realise the manner of thinking and speaking current in the New Testament, the more I feel myself called upon to give it as my opinion, that the historical Son of God, as such, cannot be called God without completely destroying the monotheistical system of the Apostles.’

meaning. It is, however, only too evident that there are men who really subscribe it in good faith, and receive its teaching as absolute truth. The genuine believers are mostly to be found in the Free Church. Mr. Martin is consistent, and, granting his premises, logical. He is thorough, and not afraid of the legitimate results of what he believes. He tells us that the view of the atonement which he advocates, is a 'revealed reality.' It is a dogma resting on the authority of inspired and infallible Scriptures, and therefore to be thoroughly believed and received by all men. It is moreover declared to be 'the doctrine of the Catholic Church.' This use of the word 'Catholic' brings us into our usual perplexity as to what men can possibly mean by it. The doctrine in question is now renounced by the whole Christian world, if we except the party in the Free Church of Scotland represented by Mr. Martin, the Particular Baptists, and a very small section of the clergy of the Church of England. When a man sets forth his own views of doctrine as 'Catholic,' we generally suspect that he is in want of a more solid argument, and that his acquaintance with the history of Christianity does not extend much beyond the history of his own sect.

Mr. Martin's doctrine is what is called the 'federal theology.' It means that God made a covenant with Christ that He should save a certain number of the human race who were included in that covenant. So that Christ did not die for man, but for some men; not for sin, but for 'sins.' His death was a literal substitution for those in the covenant, a literal price paid that they might escape punishment. Objections

on the side of reason are not to be heard against a 'revealed reality.' If they cannot be answered directly, they must find a general answer in the Divine sovereignty, which means that an 'Almighty Tyrant,' to use John Wesley's words, can do as He likes with the beings He has made. The first objection to this view of atonement is that the innocent suffers in order that the guilty may escape. By a 'legal fiction,' they are accounted righteous who are not righteous. Mr. Martin's answer is that Christ and His people are federally one; Christ has become the guilty, and His righteousness has become theirs. There is then, he concludes, no 'legal fiction,' which of course is true if Mr. Martin could prove that the identity of Christ with other men is not itself a 'legal fiction.' Another objection is that if Christ died only for some men, there is no possibility of salvation to those for whom He did not die. It is admitted that the invitation of the gospel is addressed to all, but the answer is that they cannot come. The old Calvinistic divines got out of this difficulty by the matchless scholastic distinction between a moral and a physical inability. The inability was not physical, but moral. It consisted in having no will to accept Christ's invitation to repentance and forgiveness. Mr. Martin, having found by the help of Dr. Cunningham a better answer, admits that this distinction did not meet the objection. The better answer is to show that man is responsible for his inability. The 'federal theology' easily manages this by regarding the whole human race as 'one and indivisible.' So that when Adam sinned, all sinned; and therefore all might have been, as

some will be, punished everlastingly, because of their 'federal' connection with Adam. According to Mr. Martin, this is not merely a doctrine expressly and verbally revealed in Scripture, but the only one to which we are led by 'scientific or Baconian induction.' If it were either of these, we fear that the very existence of such a dogma in the Scriptures would in the judgment of most men be sufficient, not merely to overthrow the authority of the Scriptures, but to deprive them both of value and meaning.

It is always an advantage in studying any controverted subject to get an author who is not afraid of all the legitimate results of his position. This is the case with Mr. Martin; and one thing which is clearly evident from his book is the inconsistency of those who believe in literal substitution, and yet reject the 'federal theology.' The Arminian or Wesleyan view, that Christ died for all, but that they only are saved who believe and repent, is the antithesis of Mr. Martin's doctrine; and yet it is not generally believed to contain any special heresy. Several theological writers, especially among the Independents, who have wished to adhere to Calvinism, and yet to escape its difficulties, have supposed a universal atonement for all men, but an election afterwards of some men to the benefits of that atonement. It does not seem to have occurred to these writers, any more than to the Arminians, that their theory really excludes the proper idea of literal substitution. If Christ died for every man, and yet every man is not to be saved, then all the literal ideas of satisfaction, substitution, price, and redemption must go. The dogmas supposed to be 'revealed

realities' disappear. The truth at the bottom of these theories, and common to them all, takes a simpler form, and the anti-dogmatist enters on the inquiry what that simpler form is.

We have chosen Mr. Martineau's volume for the same reason that we chose Mr. Martin's. Mr. Martineau is the representative of the descendants of the old English Presbyterians in their most advanced stage of departure from dogma. Mr. Liddon could doubtless prove that Mr. Martineau has dogmas as well as the dogmatists; that is, certain things which he believes. But our present business is to see how in his hands dogmas which others think all-important pass on to dissolution. The foundation of the 'federal theology' is the fall of man in Adam, which implies the identification of all men with Adam, and their being involved in his sin. Mr. Martineau confesses that he cannot explain the mystery of the existence of evil, but he denies that in Christianity all physical and moral evil is ascribed to the sin of Adam. He sees suffering in the world which he cannot explain; but to be told that that suffering is to be eternal is to be carried into 'deeper and gratuitous difficulties.' Supposing the fall of Adam to be the cause of the existence of evil, we see no evidence that it has been affected by the death on the cross. The 'visible' effects are visible still, and if the visible consequences of Adam's sin are unredeemed, there is a just suspicion that the invisible also are unredeemed. The announcement to Adam simply was that if he sinned he should die. To have extracted from this that he and his posterity were to suffer endless life in hell must

have required the ingenuity of a theologian. The theory of substitution is that the blow of Divine justice must fall somewhere. This can be understood in two ways. We can either suppose the Divine Being is a person, and that He refuses to forgive until satisfaction be made to Him, or we can suppose that God is impersonal, and that justice, existing eternally and necessarily, demands retribution. In the first case the Divine Being is vindictive; in the other case the universe is not ruled by will but by inevitable law. With every effort which the Calvinist makes on his scheme to defend the Divine Being from vindictiveness he falls into the idea of the Divine impersonality. What amount of truth there may be in this aspect of Deity we cannot at present inquire; but Calvinism, consistently with itself, falls back on the analogy of nature, where it finds a terrible Deity, not always just, but apparently never suffering sin to go unpunished. Mr. Martineau protests against going for analogy to that which in nature is dark and incomprehensible. That one man suffers *by* the sin of another is evident, and in this we cannot explain Divine justice; but, he says, no man suffers *for* another.* The great and manifest truth in the world of nature and of revelation is that every man must bear the punishment of his own sins. 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die.' No guilt is forgiven until it is eradicated from the soul. The atonement, then, as explained by Mr. Martineau, is simply that God forgives men who

* We are not sure that Mr. Martineau's distinction is really tenable. If one man suffers because another man does wrong, it is really suffering for another. Every man does not, at least in this life, bear the punishment of his own sin.—X.

forsake their sins; and this forgiveness is not a 'legal fiction,' like the popular doctrine of justification, but proceeds according to the degree of inner or actual regeneration.

But the question, which view has Scripture on its side, has yet to be determined. In the first three Gospels it may be admitted that there is no trace of anything like substitution for sin. The words of Isaiah, quoted in St. Matthew, that 'He bare our diseases,' are applied to Jesus healing the sick. Forgiveness is always represented as following repentance and amendment. The parables, which set forth the Divine forgiveness, as, for instance, that of the prodigal son, say nothing of substitution. In John's Gospel Jesus says, 'I lay down my life *for* the sheep.' The sense in which a good or true shepherd dies in defence of his sheep may fairly embrace all that is meant by this passage. It is chiefly in the Epistles that we find the sacrificial language on which the popular dogmas of satisfaction and propitiation are erected. And the sole question is, if this language be literal, or only an adaptation of Jewish phraseology by way of illustration of the simple fact of the Divine forgiveness. Mr. Martineau, admitting that three or four sacrificial passages are to be found in the Gospels and the Acts, and holding this distinction to be nearly true, yet lays down one which he regards as absolutely true. It is that the language supposed to teach the atoning efficacy of the cross does not occur in the New Testament until the beginning of the Gentile controversy. By His death Christ ceased to be merely the Jewish Messiah, and

opened the kingdom of heaven to the Gentiles. He was lifted up that He might draw all men unto Him. He laid down His life that He might bring together the 'other sheep not of this fold.' With considerable ingenuity this principle is applied to the sacrificial language of St. Paul's Epistles. The Epistle to the Hebrews is excepted. In it we have all the Jewish phraseology, and indeed the whole Jewish economy spiritualised or applied by way of adaptation or illustration to Christ. This was done to satisfy the Hebrews for the loss of their temple-worship and ritual. In this Epistle Christ is spoken of as offering up sacrifice once for all; for *His own sins*, and also for the sins of the people. The Epistle with Mr. Martineau is simply a Jewish mode of exhibiting or illustrating the Divine forgiveness.

To the same conclusion, concerning the sacrificial language of the New Testament, Mr. Jowett has come in his study of St. Paul's Epistles. 'Passing allusions,' he says, 'figures of speech, rhetorical oppositions, have been made the foundation of doctrinal statements, which are like a part of the human mind itself, and seem as if they never could be uprooted without uprooting the very sentiment of religion.' The 'federal theology' which Mr. Martin lauds as 'a noble catalogue of revealed truth,' Mr. Jowett cannot find anywhere in the Scriptures. Concerning its first principle, Mr. Jowett says, 'How slender is the foundation in the New Testament for the doctrine of Adam's sin being imputed to his posterity—two passages from St. Paul at most, and these of uncertain interpretation. The little cloud, no bigger than a

man's hand, has covered the heavens.' The words, indeed, of the two passages are plain—'As in Adam all die,' and 'By one man sin entered into the world.' But did they mean to St. Paul what they are understood to mean now? Was Adam's sin the cause of death to all his posterity in any different way than as Abraham was a father of circumcision to the uncircumcised? This is a parallel case of St. Paul's mode of speaking. Where he says all died in Adam, is it the same that is meant as in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, where he says, 'If one died for all, then all died?' The Apostle's words need not mean more than that Adam's sin was the cause of the sins of his posterity. The 'federal theology,' like many other theologies, has to go about for explanations. The second clause of the first passage is, 'So in Christ shall all be made alive.' But Mr. Martin comes in to say that the 'all' in the second clause only means all that are in the covenant, not all that died in Adam. If the words are to be taken in the simple sense which they have to us, they mean clearly that as *all* men fell in Adam, so *all* shall be ultimately restored through Christ. And, indeed, this accords with the whole argument of the chapter. 'Every man in his own order; Christ the firstfruits, afterwards they that are Christ's, then cometh the end.' The last enemy is to be destroyed, all things subdued, and the consummation is a complete restoration to the bosom of the Father when 'God shall be all things in all things.' Mr. Jowett finds in St. Paul's Epistles that Christ's dying for us is the same as His living for us. The nearest and best conception he takes to be that furnished by Christ

Himself, who spoke of a good man dying for his friends; or this death for us may mean that He identified Himself with our troubles and sorrows. It may edify Mr. Martin and some other advocates of the 'Catholic faith' to know that there was no doctrine of atonement in any primitive creed, and that according to the great Fathers of the ancient Church, the price was paid, not to God, but to the great enemy.

It is with considerable satisfaction that we can number among anti-dogmatists a bishop of the Episcopal Church of Scotland. That Church, perhaps, never had any very luminous virtues, and of late years its poverty has made it the prey of an extreme party in the Church of England. At the present hour, it is letting slip a golden opportunity for introducing into Scotland something of the culture and liberality of sentiment which now, happily, have made considerable progress in the Church of England. It might do much to lessen the sectarianism and the dogmatism which are among the chief evils of religious parties in Scotland. But we fear it is only introducing an intensified sectarianism, which is different merely in species, not in genus, from the narrowest sects. Their operations are diversified; but it is one and the self-same spirit which is at work. The Bishop of Argyll is evidently an exception. We do not venture to speak of the benefits which Mr. Hugh Martin, and those whom he represents, might derive from the paternal counsels and godly admonitions of this Right Reverend Father in God.

The object which the writers of the Present-Day

Papers seem to have before them, is to try how much of the dogmatic incrustations that have gathered around Christianity may be removed without injury to the essence of Christianity. They are not unconscious of the difficulty, and even the danger, of the work which they have undertaken. Their spirit is cautious and reverent; conscious, on the one hand, that some of the popular dogmas are the chief causes of unbelief, and conscious also that by many they will be themselves regarded as promoting that unbelief. Speaking of the departure of some in the present time from the faith of Christianity, one of the writers says—

‘ We do not look on it as hopeless, or with unmitigated fear, for we are under the impression that the present is no final, but merely a transition stage, where the things which have served their purpose and become effete are being superseded by those things which are real and cannot pass away. It signifieth, we believe, but the removing of the things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain.’

The preface gives a definition of Revelation different from the ordinary one, and simpler. It takes the word as it stands, meaning ‘ a giving of light, an unveiling.’ It is not an additional mystery to the mysteries of nature, but something whereby we are to understand what is dark and mysterious in nature. It is something which speaks to the reason and the conscience; whatever then in the Scriptures is dark can be no part of Revelation. None of the writers have treated of the doctrine of the Trinity, which must always be the main test, whether or not there are any mysteries in Christianity which claim to be

believed as mysteries. Anything in the Scriptures which seems contrary to our sense of right, on this principle can be no part of Revelation.

The first paper is a reprint from William Law's 'Spirit of Love.' The subject is the Atonement. William Law, we suppose, is reprinted because of what he said, and not for the mere authority of his name. When he wrote this tract he had become a follower of Jacob Böhme. He does not deny 'a justice of God which requires satisfaction done to it before man could be reconciled,' but he denies that this favours the opinion of wrath or resentment in God. The wrath to be atoned is nothing else but sin or disorder in the creature. When sin is extinguished in the creature, all the wrath that is between God and the creature is fully atoned. If the wrath is to be taken away from God, then the atonement would be for his benefit, and not for the benefit of man. St. Paul says we 'are by nature children of wrath;' and David says, 'Thine arrows stick fast in me. Thy hand presseth me sore.' These, and such passages, are understood to mean simply the dominion of sin and its necessary consequences. The work of atonement is the work of regeneration; it is 'Christ given unto us.' Sin brings its necessary punishment, not because God wills it, but because He cannot change His own nature; He cannot give blessedness to any but the righteous. The atonement of Christ is God putting an end to sin, and death, and hell. There is nothing in it supernatural. It is 'only nature set right, or made to be that which it ought to be.' The question here, as before, concerns the sense in which

the Scriptures are to be understood, and how far reason and conscience are to be guides in interpreting them. The difficulty of dogma is only the difficulty of Scripture interpretation intensified. The Bishop of Argyll has often said that the statement in the second of the Thirty-nine Articles—Christ died ‘to reconcile His Father to us’—can only be received in a conventional sense. ‘A bargain has no relation to love; but Christ’s wounds are the outgoings of God’s love, the pledge of its reality, the gauge of its depth, not equivalents for sin.’ Of the fruits of sin, it is said, there never is remission. But Christ went among the wheels of a disordered creation to bring it into unison. He delivered from sin rather than from the penalty; indeed, from the penalty only by eradicating sin. Salvation, regeneration, and justification proceed with equal steps. We are saved, regenerated, and justified just in the degree that sin is removed and the life of Christ has become real within us. The author of the last Paper in the series, ‘Eternal Life Manifested,’ says, ‘The life was incarnated in Jesus Christ, and then from Him and through Him, as a medium, it is communicated to men on earth.’ This, he adds in a note, ‘is the entire sense of the doctrine of mediation. The mediator of artificial theology, standing between an offended God and sinful creatures, is a dishonouring and unscriptural invention.’

Putting, as we have done, on one side Mr. Liddon, Mr. Garbett, and Mr. Hugh Martin, and, on the other side, the writers of these Papers, it is evident that there is a wide interval between the principles of the dogmatists and the anti-dogmatists. And yet

both sides are willing to stand by the Scriptures. Mr. Liddon's argument, which we already remarked was beside the real question at issue, is, nevertheless, correct in its own place. He argues truly that religion cannot be separated from theology. Men will reason. They will define, and their definitions and reasonings must be metaphysical. The definitions in the creeds are the efforts of the writers to express their conceptions of certain doctrines. The first development of dogma is distinctly to be traced in the New Testament itself. The teaching of Jesus, as recorded by the first three Evangelists, is in the main practical. In John's Gospel we have not only Christ's doctrine, but a doctrine concerning Christ. The Apostle had become familiar with the metaphysical terms of the Alexandrine philosophy. By means of them he illustrated and defended the doctrine of the incarnation. Some English writers have thought it necessary to deny this; but it is manifest to all unprejudiced scholars. Christianity had an inheritance from the philosophy of the Greeks. The writer of the fourth Gospel made use of the terms and modes of thought current in that age to express his conceptions of the doctrines of Christianity. St. Paul and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews were evidently not unacquainted with the Alexandrine philosophy, though they delight more in Jewish forms, both of speech and thought. These are manifest proofs of Mr. Liddon's principle that men will not, probably cannot, stop at religion, but must go on to construct a theology. The two schools of Christian philosophy that existed among the Fathers, and the

dogmas peculiar to each, are well known to all who are familiar with the history of theology. Mr. Liddon puts them together as one bundle, and dignifies the whole with the title of 'the ripe decisions which we owe to the illuminated mind of Primitive Christendom.' Besides these 'ripe decisions,' we owe not a few definitions to the scholastics. As Protestants, we have also to receive the dogmas that grew out of the controversies of the Reformation, while Roman Catholics have to abide by those made at Trent—often out of mere opposition to the doctrines of the Reformers. The question, we repeat, is not that men will make dogmas, or go on trying to define what they believe. The question is, if these dogmas or definitions are to be received as imposed by authority. If so, where is the authority? Without a claim to infallibility, no Church can pretend to have authority to impose dogmas. We go back, then, to the Scriptures.

There are here three things to be distinguished from each other—How we understand the Scriptures, what the writers really mean, and what was the extent of their knowledge. Mr. Liddon forbids us 'to exercise thought on the Christian Revelation.' Mr. Garbett tells us that the province of reason is confined to the evidences of a Divine Revelation. The great principle of the Reformation was the right of every man to judge of the meaning of the Scriptures. It did not advocate any abuse of private judgment in the sense of every man putting on the Scriptures whatever sense he fancied. But it did advocate the individual responsibility of every man, and his obli-

gation to be guided by his own convictions. One of the writers in the Bishop of Argyll's Papers says that this principle cannot be separated from another; which is, that 'we are free to judge what is Revelation or not.' If we are bound by the Scriptures only as we have capacity to understand them, then the measure of that capacity is the measure of what we are to believe—that is, of the dogmas we are to receive. Whatever is clearly taught in the Scriptures, that alone is to be received by Christians. But this obviously may be far short of what is really in the Scripture. To get at the real meaning, for instance, of St. Paul's Epistles is no easy matter. The infallible Church of Rome has never ventured on any infallible interpretation. The keenest intellects and the greatest scholars of modern times are unable, in many cases, to find out the stand-point from which the Apostle is discoursing. They find it impossible to enter the circle of ideas that prevailed in his time. They do not know the precise force of his modes of reasoning or the limits of his rhetoric, and they can only guess at the mental characters and capacities of those to whom his Epistles were written. Our understanding, then, of much of the Pauline theology may be very different from what that theology really is.

The last consideration concerns the infallibility of the writers of the New Testament. Do they speak infallibly? Do they profess to speak infallibly? What is the date of the dogma of infallible and authoritative Scriptures? Mr. Garbett says that he is not ashamed to hold the Scriptures infallible, because he is in company with the great names of Fathers and

Reformers. In another place he applies the closing words of the Apocalypse to the whole of the New Testament, as if it had then been all written and collected into one volume; and he adds, 'Here the voice of inspiration ceases. As its last solemn accents die away upon the ear, the Church takes up the cry and echoes on the testimony. The simple tones of her multitudinous tongues no longer carry with them the force of an infallible inspiration; but the ordinary gifts of the Spirit still remained.' Mr. Garbett says so; but where is the authority, dogmatic or undogmatic, for this distinction between the inspiration of the New Testament and the inspiration of the Church? This surely will not be dignified as the 'Catholic faith,' or as a 'ripe decision of Primitive Christendom.' Doubtless we desire that the Scriptures always spoke clearly and infallibly. We crave infallibility. An infallible Church would be the satisfaction of our heart's desires. But what we long for must not be confounded with what is. Is St. Paul never wrong? Was he not in error about Christ's second coming? Are all his rhetorical arguments and illustrations infallible, or did he even suppose that they were? Must the Christian Revelation go to the ground if Professor Huxley proves that a seed sown does not die before it brings forth fruit, or if Mr. Darwin proves that physical death did not enter the world by the sin of Adam? The story of Adam and Eve is believed to be only a myth by many Christians who have no difficulty in supposing that St. Paul spoke according to the best of his knowledge. The question then culminates in this, if even the

speculative theology of the Apostles is binding on us with the authority of dogma. And Mr. Garbett has not failed to see that this is the real point of the conflict between dogmatist and anti-dogmatist. It is idle for either side not to look the question fairly in the face. In Mr. Garbett's words—Are the Scriptures the creators of faith or its products, the embodiment of the religious consciousness of different periods of the world? The only way to settle this question is by an examination of what the Scriptures are and what they profess to be.

The objection, then, of the anti-dogmatist does not appear to be against believing certain doctrines, but against receiving any doctrines coming as dogmas—that is, claiming to be received in virtue of an authority which overrides reason and conscience. The necessity for putting our beliefs into definite forms is admitted; but it is denied that these forms are either permanent or infallible. Some dogmas have become associated with certain phases of piety, and are appropriate vehicles for its expression. Who objects to sing Toplady's hymn, 'Rock of Ages,' redolent as it is with that theology which makes the death of Christ salvation 'from wrath?' In prayers, in hymns, and even in definitions of doctrine, we must receive many conceptions, to use the Bishop of Argyll's word, 'conventionally,' feeling that if they express partially certain things that are true, yet they express them the more vividly in virtue perhaps of that partiality which is itself inseparable from definite conception. If illustration and speculation concerning the death of Christ were forbidden, some preachers would have but little

to say in their sermons. They would be deprived of the means of conveying thoughts to multitudes of minds. Many who would be unaffected by a discourse from Mr. Jowett or Mr. Martineau, concerning that Divine love which has no anger to be appeased, would be instructed by John Bunyan's exposition of the parable of the barren fig-tree, where the Father in justice commands it to be cut down, and the Son in mercy pleads for another year of probation. The discourses of the learned writers of the 'Present-Day Papers' would be unmeaning to thousands who are edified by Mr. Spurgeon when he preaches on what God has done for them for 'Christ's sake,' notwithstanding that the text is a notorious mistranslation of the original Greek.* And all this brings us back to the fact that it is with the religious consciousness that preachers have to deal, and not with formal definitions of theology, except so far as these definitions help to work upon that consciousness. The mischief appears when the dogmatists of different sects begin the enunciation of their dogmas with a 'Quicumque vult,' and end with an anathema that he who does not think as they do shall 'without doubt everlastingly perish.' In this sense Dr. Schenkel is right when he describes orthodoxy as the sin against the Holy Ghost.

The anti-dogmatists wish to stand by what Lessing calls 'the Christianity of Christ,' that is, practical religion as taught by Jesus Himself, consisting of love to God and love to man. These are to be placed in the first rank along with whatever in the New Testament is manifestly clear to the reason and the con-

* See a sermon on Ephesians iv. 32.

science. That which is plain is that which is revealed. It belongs to us. What is secret we may desire to look into; but we are not to take the words of men, nor the definitions of men, as the words of God. We are not to bow before the 'ripe decisions of Primitive Christendom,' nor the subtle definitions of scholastic doctors, nor the symbolic books of the learned Reformers. We also are men. The same responsibility is given to us that was given to them. They judged for themselves according to the light that was in them; so we too must judge for ourselves, and seek to share that light which shone in them. In taking up this position the anti-dogmatist places himself in harmony with the matured judgment of the universal reason of humanity. He begins with what is evident. He walks by the light which he has. He performs faithfully his present duty; and for the rest of the path of existence he goes on trustfully till the day break and the shadows flee away.

VII.

THE BISHOPS AND THE REVISION OF THE BIBLE.*

A FEW weeks ago the members of Sion College were summoned to an 'Evening Meeting,' at which Professor Bonamy Price was to read a paper on 'A Rational Government for the Church of England.' Before beginning his paper, the Professor begged to explain that the word 'rational' had been inserted by some other hand. It was not in the original title, and it seemed to imply that the Church of England had not a rational government. The interpolation was due to the ingenuity of the president of Sion, who resembled one of whom we read in the New Testament, that being high priest that year he 'prophesied.' The majority of the bishops of the Roman Church had just stultified themselves in the face of the civilised universe, but we did think that, so far as our bishops represented the Church, we really had some approach to a rational government in the Church of England. Time, however, which proves all things, has proved that we

* Contemporary Review, April, 1871.

were wrong, and that the prophetic soul of the president of Sion was dimly and mysteriously in the right.

It is now a long time since the desire became general among Biblical scholars for a revision of the authorised translation of the Bible. Like all ideas in our naturally conservative country that affect changes, its progress towards realisation has been slow but sure. There were many difficulties which were felt by all the promoters of revision. The words of the present translation are familiar to us. The very sound of them is sacred. To the multitude of people who have read the Scriptures only in this translation, the religious ideas and feelings are so wedded to the words that to change them seems to be changing the Bible itself. The translation, too, was a grand work for its day. It had the advantage of being made when our language was in its spring-time, capable of all the suppleness and rejoicing in all the strength of youth. And then it was done when there was but one Church in England. It has thus become the inheritance of all nations who speak the English language of whatever Church or sect, with the sole exception of those who adhere to the Church of Rome. It was something for the great Anglo-Protestant world to be agreed in the use of one translation of the Bible. The necessity of preserving this catholicity in the use of the same translation was felt by every advocate of revision. All sides were prepared that revision should be abandoned rather than this should fail.

In due time the subject was taken up by Convocation. No one, not even the most extreme Dissenter, could say that Convocation was not the proper

body to undertake the superintendence of the revision. That body, indeed, is only a 'clerical meeting,' not the largest, but certainly the most important clerical meeting in England. It was evident to every member of Convocation that if the revised translation was to be accepted by all who accept the present, members of other religious bodies external to the Church of England must be invited to give their assistance and co-operation. On this account a few members, a very few, opposed revision altogether. There are some odd men in every community, and they are not wanting, and never have been wanting, in the Church of England. Some eccentric idea about 'the Church' alone having power and right to bind and loose the Scriptures, led some in Convocation to oppose revision. Other members, whose ideas may be a little out of harmony with what is going on in the world at the present hour, were yet willing that scholars from all religious communities might be invited as helpers. But the majority, believing that the authorised version of the Bible was as much the inheritance of the English Dissenters as of the Church of England, were glad of the opportunity of uniting the National Church and the Dissenters in one great work which was truly National as well as Christian. Accordingly among the resolutions passed in Convocation, there was one that the Committee appointed to undertake the work of revision be 'at liberty to invite the co-operation of any persons eminent for scholarship to whatever nation or religious body they may belong.' This resolution was drawn up by the Bishop of Winchester. It was opposed by the party opposed to

revision. Archdeacon Denison, with that fine perception which enables him to diagnose heresy at any distance either of time or space, proposed an amendment by adding the words 'save only and except such as deny the divinity of Christ.' After a debate on the desirability of admitting Jews and Unitarians, the amendment was lost by a majority of twenty-three against seven. On the strength of this resolution, the Committee invited scholars from other religious bodies, and among them Mr. Vance Smith, as a representative of the Unitarians.

The Revisionists began their work on June 22nd by a commemoration in Westminster Abbey of the Last Supper of Jesus with His disciples. Notice had been sent by the Dean of Westminster to every member that such a celebration of the Communion would be held. Among the communicants was Mr. Vance Smith. This event shocked the susceptibilities of some High Churchmen and of a few Evangelicals. It evoked the usual comments in the 'religious' newspapers, and it furnished a luxurious feast for some of the more rabid 'Church' prints of the Philistine order, which manage to exist by being outrageous. This died out in its time, and the work of revision was going on from strength to strength.

On the 14th of February, this year, the Convocation reassembled after the Christmas recess. The *Guardian* gravely records that there were seventeen bishops present, and that in the Lower House the attendance was larger than usual. The Bishop of London took the chair, uttering ominous words of sorrow that the Primate was absent, and betraying the consciousness

of a gathering storm. There were dark clouds in the horizon and indications of the special presence of some of nature's unseen but subtle powers. The Bishop of Winchester arose, and then

‘ A child might understand
The devil had business on his hand.’

He said that he never meant to include Unitarians in the Company of Revisers, though his own hand drew up the resolution that scholars should be invited, ‘ to whatever nation or religious body they may belong.’ He was surprised that Mr. Vance Smith had been invited, and he shared in the indignation which had arisen about the Communion in the Abbey. He had letters from American bishops who agreed with him, and he believed that the orthodox Nonconformists were equally opposed to the admission of a Unitarian to aid in the work. He therefore proposed a resolution, ‘ That, in the judgment of this House, it is not expedient that any person who denies the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ should be invited to assist in the revision of the Scriptures ; and that it is the judgment, further, of this House, that any such one now in either company should cease to act forthwith.’

This resolution was seconded by the Bishop of London, as the only atonement he could make for having himself advocated that the Committee should be on a broad and liberal basis. It never occurred to him that members of ‘ the Socinian body ’ could be invited. The Bishop of Llandaff rose to explain that it was by his vote that Mr. Vance Smith was among the Revisionists. There were five votes for him, and four against, the bishop voting with the majority. He

was surprised to learn that the gentleman for whom he had voted was a Unitarian; but the bishop was deaf, and did not know for whom he was voting. There is a story of Dr. Blacklock, the blind Scotch poet and preacher, that he once preached in a kirk in the south of Scotland, to the great delight of all who heard him. There was at the time a great prejudice in Scotland against reading sermons. An elder remarked to an old woman coming out of the church that they had heard a fine sermon. 'Yes,' said the woman, 'but does he read?' 'No, no,' said the elder, 'he canna read; he's blind.' 'Thank God!' exclaimed the old woman, 'I wish they were a' blind.' The Bishop of Gloucester said that this resolution was intended to include Jews, but not Unitarians, who were divided from us by a gulf of difference which is 'everlasting.' Some coruscations of light came from the Bishop of Ely; but to be followed only by the blackness of darkness. He could not see how Jews were to be included and Unitarians excluded. Jews he said were Unitarians, and denied not merely the divinity of Christ, but also his Messiahship, and some even his historical existence. Dr. Harold Browne had voted for Mr. Vance Smith. But since the Communion at the Abbey he had passed a perpetual Lent. The penitent bishop spoke frequently at all the sittings of Convocation—rivalling Augustine in his retractations and Luther in sorrow for his sin. 'I regret,' 'I am sorry,' 'I retract,' again and again repeated the bishop—

'In his fine confessions
Which make most people envy his transgressions.'

The Bishop of Lincoln rejoiced that this calamity had overtaken the Revisionists. Had they taken his advice, they would have limited their company to members of the Anglo-Episcopal communities. This, he said, was done in the time of King James, when Bishop Andrewes was Dean of Westminster. That orthodox and truly Anglican dean did not employ Jews, Infidels, Turks, Heretics, and other Dissenters to revise the Scriptures. He confined the work to members of the Anglican Communion. An ingenious person once proposed instituting a missionary society for the conversion of bishops. It was never, we believe, established; but a society for instructing the bishops in the history of the Church of England seems to be a necessity. If the Bishop of Lincoln will read Dean Barlow's account of the Hampton Court Conference, he will find that the proposal for the revision of the Bible in the time of King James, came from the Puritans. It was one of the things which their leader, Dr. Rainolds, was instructed to bring before the Conference. And if the Bishop will search out what is known of the lives of the translators of King James's Bible, he will find that some of them battled to the death against the 'Anglicanism' of Bishop Andrewes.* The Non-conformists of that day were neither allowed to be

* It is enough to mention the best known—Rainolds, President of Corpus Christi, and Chaderton, Master of Emmanuel, two representative Puritans; Abbot, the Puritan Archbishop, and Miles Smith, Bishop of Gloucester, who prevented Laud, when Dean of Gloucester, from turning the Communion Table 'altar-wise'—a turning which has made it impossible for any clergyman to keep the rubric concerning the north side, and which has brought down on High Churchmen the recent just judgment. An indignant 'Anglican' historian says that Miles Smith converted all the churches of his diocese into conventicles.

separate from the Church, nor did they wish to be separate. To include, therefore, at least the orthodox Dissenters, was to imitate, in our altered circumstances, the plan of the old translators.

Three bishops opposed the Bishop of Winchester's resolution. The Bishop of St. David's did not ask whether the Revisionists were 'Unitarians, Deists, or Atheists.' The only thing to which he looked was efficient scholarship. He could not see that the Westminster Communion had any connection with the question before them. The Bishop of Exeter pleaded that the Convocation must keep faith with those who had been invited from other religious bodies; and the Bishop of Bath and Wells was thankful for 'the blessed opportunity of communion with our Nonconformist brethren.'

The debate was continued next day. The Bishop of Rochester spoke first. Simple unsophisticated Dr. Cloughton could not see the necessity of the winding ways of the astute Bishop of Winchester to compass his end. He would apply the knife at once, and cut off the offending heretic. Why should we keep faith with men who do not believe as we do? Replying to the Bishop of Exeter, he said that such 'precious things' as 'good faith and pledged faith,' must be thrown 'overboard,' to make 'reparation to the injured honour of our Lord and Saviour!' It is difficult to express the solemn sorrow and the infinite pity which possessed and overwhelmed our whole being on reading these words. For some speculative difference in theology, we are to sacrifice the most sacred and the most certain of human obligations. Is

this the religion of Jesus Christ? or is it, as the Dean of Westminster said, the religion of the old Pagans? Bring your sacrifices and appease the all-devouring god. Violate every human affection, every human duty, every relation between man and man, and for the honour of Him—oh, my soul, utter it not!—of Him who sacrificed Himself for all that was human—of Him who preferred mercy to sacrifice, who did not break the bruised reed, and whose whole life was one continual protest against wrong-doing under the pretence of honouring God, and against those who supposed that wrong-doing did not mean the same in heaven that it does on earth. The Bishops of Bangor and St. Asaph agreed with the Bishop of Rochester; and the Bishop of Chichester added that not only good faith, but ‘logic and consistency’ too must go, and that in the renunciation of these things his brother bishops had done ‘a noble act of self-sacrifice!’

‘Pró Superi, quantum mortalia pectora cæcæ
Noctis habent! ipso sceleris molimine Tereus,
Creditor esse pius; laudemque a crimine sumit.’

‘Alas!’ cried the Dean of Westminster, in an outburst of impassioned eloquence, and carried beyond himself with indignation at this blasphemy against the Son of Man—‘Alas! and has it come to this, that our boasted orthodoxy has landed us in this hideous heresy! Is it possible that it should be supposed that we can consent for a moment to degrade the divine attributes of our Lord Jesus Christ to the level of a mere capricious heathen deity? Can we believe that anything but dishonour can be conferred on Him by making His name a pretext for inconsistency, for vacil-

lation, for a breach of faith between two contending parties? I have read in that sacred book—the meaning of which it was the object of this revision to bring out more clearly to the people of England—I have read in that sacred book that one of the characteristics of those who dwell on God’s holy hill is, “whoso sweareth to his neighbour and disappointeth him not, though it be to his own hindrance.” I have also found that in the other part of the sacred book it is declared, “Not every one that saith, Lord, Lord, but he that doeth the will of my Father”—and we know that the will of the Father is judgment, justice, and truth—“shall enter into the kingdom of heaven.” I for one lift up my voice against any such detestable doctrine as that our Lord and Saviour can be honoured in any way but by a strict adherence to the laws of honour, integrity, and truth. I repudiate the notion that anything but dishonour can be brought on His sacred name by that which, from every recorded word and every act of His sacred life, we must be certain He would have entirely opposed.’ The resolution was passed by ten bishops against four. Three have already been honourably mentioned. The fourth is the Bishop of Oxford, who has achieved a noble reputation by one stroke.

The inauguration of the resolution into the Lower House was not without promise of a repetition of what had passed among the bishops. Dr. Jelf, in moving that the resolution be adopted, deliberately and solemnly declared his conviction that ‘it was due to the direct influence of God’s Holy Spirit!’ At the Hampton Court Conference, in the days when the

divinity of the king was an orthodox episcopal dogma, one of the bishops, marvelling at the wisdom of James, said that his Majesty spoke by the Holy Ghost. A profane Scotch minister, a representative of the Kirk, is said to have expressed doubts, in words which we do not care to quote, concerning the purity of the channel of the Divine communications. If bishops are to be found who openly advocate that the most sacred of human obligations are to be sacrificed for what they suppose to be the honour of the Deity, it is not marvellous that a mere presbyter should believe that these bishops were guided by the Holy Ghost. Other members spoke in favour of the resolution. Canon Gregory denied that there was any obligation to be violated, as no meeting had taken place between the two contracting parties. Archdeacon Freeman was opposed to the presence on the Committee of men who did not hold their views of the Christian faith, on the ground that the true interpretation of the Scriptures was independent of 'the ordinary laws and rules of criticism.' Dr. Fraser would not have a Unitarian among the Revisionists, because the Church was the keeper and witness of Holy Writ, and its revision might touch the faith and salvation of millions. Canon Seymour said that St. John would not have committed the translation of the Scriptures to one that denied the Godhead of Christ; and Canon Woodgate said plainly that it was a 'sin' to have put this gentleman on the Committee.

Wiser counsels, however, prevailed. The Dean of Westminster opposed the resolution on three grounds:—(1) That it involves on its very face a breach of

good faith, a scandalous inconsistency and vacillation on the part of this venerable House of Convocation. (2) It involves by implication a new principle in the translation of the Holy Scriptures, and one which scholars in all such matters ought entirely to repudiate. (3) The resolution, as worded, is intrinsically absurd and impracticable.' On the first head, the Dean went into the history of the resolution which it was now proposed to rescind. It had been deliberately debated by the House, opposed by Archdeacon Denison, defended by the lamented Dean Alford, and carried by an overwhelming majority. On the second head he showed that the present resolution, by excluding men of certain theological opinions, would change the ground of impartial criticism on which the revision was originally based. And thirdly, to exclude only those who deny the Godhead of Christ was to leave an open door for those who denied the Godhead of the Father and of the Holy Ghost. The resolution, by condemning the doctrine of the Unitarians, would exclude all except the disciples of Swedenborg. The really orthodox and only eligible members of the Committee would be those who believed that the all of the Infinite was concentrated in the person of Christ. Canon Selwyn confirmed the Dean's account of the original resolution against some exceptions that had been made by the Bishop of Gloucester, and vindicated the necessity of having the Scriptures revised according to the real meaning of the text uninfluenced by any theological bias. Mr. De Winton added his testimony to the accuracy of the Dean's account, and dwelt on the great advantage of having the judgment

of a Unitarian on Trinitarian texts. Archdeacon Moore and Canon Blakesley pleaded that the character of the House for honesty and good faith must be preserved. Archdeacons Chapman and Fearon spoke with great wisdom of the unfeigned faith and piety of many Unitarians whom they had known, and how difficult it often is to draw a line between their views of Christ and the orthodox faith of the Church of England.

The debate lasted two days. On the morning of the second day, it was known that the Bishop of St. David's had retired from the Revision in consequence of the Bishop of Winchester's resolution. It was known, too, that he had forced the Upper House to accept a resolution avowedly proposed in contradiction to the Bishop of Winchester's resolution, to the effect that the Revisionists were to be guided solely by criticism, and not by theological opinions. The knowledge of these things gave new life to the Bishop of Winchester's opponents in the Lower House. Archdeacon Moore, in announcing with deep regret the retirement of Bishop Thirlwall, pronounced on the Bishop an eloquent and well-deserved eulogium. 'If,' said the Archdeacon, 'the resolution were carried, it would drive from them the Bishop of St. David's, who was not the least amongst the greatest scholars of Europe, and who possessed one of the greatest judicial minds that ever dwelt in a human form; a prelate distinguished for his integrity and honesty; who when at Cambridge retained his opinions through good report and evil report, without hesitation or flinching, although it was to his own detriment. He was a man

of whom it might be said *in corrupta fides nudaque veritas.*' The Lower House declined to vote the previous question, but it passed a resolution to the effect that no opinion be expressed on the resolution of the bishops, until the work of revision be finished. This was gladly accepted by the Upper House as a welcome escape from the toils in which they were involved by the Bishop of Winchester's resolution. The Bishop of St. David's then withdrew his resignation, and Mr. Vance Smith continues among the Revisionists. The schemes of the Bishop of Winchester and his friends have been defeated. Their hands have not been able to perform their enterprise, and they have groped in the noon-day as in the night.

Μάρηην σε Θεοὶ θέσαν, οἳ τε δύνανται
 Ἄφρονα ποιῆσαι καὶ ἐπίφρονά περ μαλ' ἶόντα
 Καὶ τε χαλιφρονίοντα σαοφροσύνης ἐπέβησαν.*

This strange episode in the history of the revision of the Bible has received but little notice from the news journals. The *Guardian* has been full and fair in its reports, but sparing in its comments. The *Times* has preserved a benignant and merciful silence. It is in the tide of history that its real significance will bubble up. In the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth, before the meetings of Convocation were forbidden by the Crown, there was generally a pitched battle between the two Houses. The Lower House, which then represented the ignorance and passion of the inferior clergy, con-

* 'The best laid schemes o' mice and men
 Gang aft a gley.'

Scotch version by Robert Burns.

demned heretical books written by the bishops; and the dignified 'Fathers in God' treated the Lower House with the infinite compassion and gentleness of wise and loving parents towards weak and erring children. But on this occasion it is the Lower House which has had to guide the 'Fathers' and to preserve their feet lest they should stumble and fall. Alas! where now are the Tillotsons and the Stillingfleets? The see of Gloucester has not an Edward Fowler, nor Ely a Simon Patrick. Gilbert Burnet does not come from Salisbury, Thomas Tenison from Lincoln, nor John Williams from Chichester. John Moore is no longer at Norwich, nor Thomas Sprat at Rochester, and Winchester has not even its Peter Mew. We do not, however, forget that Tait was absent, and that Thirlwall and Temple were on the right side.

The informal reason of this Convocation panic was the Westminster communion, which was, as the Bishop of St. David's said, and as every member of either House who had not sacrificed his judgment as well as his 'consistency' knew to be, altogether distinct from the question of a Unitarian being among the Revisionists. Mr. Vance Smith, like any other Englishman, was at liberty to join in any act of worship in the National Church, and no clergyman could lawfully have refused to give him the Sacrament.* The bishops may have forgotten the constitution of the Church of England, but if they had looked at their Prayer-Books they would have found

* Chancellor Massingberd quoted a statute of the time of Edward VI., which forbids any clergyman to deny the sacrament to any person humbly and devoutly desiring it.

that it binds no creed on the laity, and lays down no condition of communion but a Christian life. A clergyman is only at liberty to refuse the Sacrament to 'a notorious and evil liver.' There is no court to take cognisance of a layman's theology. The people are nowhere compelled to conform to all which the Church teaches. This was Stillingfleet's great argument with the Nonconformists. The ministers had to take oaths and make subscriptions, but with the scruples of the people no one could interfere. This has been the spirit of the Church of England, in all times of her history, since the government passed from the bishops to the Crown. Before the days of toleration it was imperative on all parishioners, as the rubric distinctly states, to receive the communion at least four times in the year. Two hundred years ago compulsion to the communion was openly advocated, if not practised. 'Compel them to come in' is the text of a sermon or tract by Dr. Henry Hesketh, who was rector of St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, in the reign of Charles II.* Dr. Hesketh vindicates the practice—not for a moment doubting that it was the acknowledged law of the Church. He says that in compelling men to receive the Lord's Supper, 'the governors of Church and State

* In Dr. Williams's library it is found in a supplementary volume to a work which was representative in its time, called 'Cases and Discourses to Recover Dissenters.' In Sion College's Library there is an answer to this tract, in which the writer maintains that to compel men to the Communion was not the law of the Church of England. The argument is grounded on the exhortations in the Prayer-Book that the communicants come prepared. The general belief, however, at the time was that compulsion was the law of the Church. It is recorded of Bishop Lloyd, of Norwich, in 1686, that he 'set a day for Dissenters to come to the Sacrament, and if they do not come then, he will proceed against them with all severity.' (See Dr. Stoughton's 'Church of the Restoration,' vol. ii. p. 143.)

are actuated by kindness, and not by any consideration for their own interests; they are compelling Nonconformists to their greatest good—that is, to have their souls strengthened and nourished by the body and blood of Christ.’

We cannot prove that any Unitarian was compelled to receive the Sacrament, but we can prove what is equally important for the argument, that Unitarians did receive it without compulsion. The Unitarians of that day were Conformists to the Church of England. Thomas Firmin, their leader, was a worshipper at St. Lawrence Jewry, when Tillotson was vicar, and afterwards at Lombard Street, where Dr. Outram was minister. Tillotson and Outram both wrote against Socinianism, but the thought of excommunicating Thomas Firmin and his Unitarian friends was never for a moment entertained. They did not wish to do it, and if they had wished they dared not have done it. Our bishops may dislike their position as servants of the State. If they do, let them say so, and join the Ritualists for disestablishment. But while they are the bishops of the National Church, the law will not allow them to reduce that Church to the dimensions of a sect. English Christians may still say to the clergy, as Rowland Hill did to the Close Communion Baptists, that the communion-table is not their table, but the table of the Lord.

It is, of course, possible to quote canons or to raise difficulties of a technical kind. This was done by the clergy in the last century when they expelled the followers of John Wesley. They were refused the Sacrament on the ground of the canons of 1603, that

the Communion is not to be administered to schismatics. The authority of these canons was always doubtful; but if they have authority, we might ask, as Wesley often did, who keeps them? They forbid the clergy to wear night-caps unless they are made of silk or velvet,—which, however, may be the material of ritualistic night-caps,—but they also declare that depravers of the Royal Supremacy are excommunicate, *ipso facto*. The gentlemen of St. Alban's need not then wonder that they are afloat, for they have been overtaken by the 'Excommunicatio latæ sententiæ.' An argument founded on a technicality in a rubric is equally vain. It may be said that Mr. Vance Smith did not give notice the day before the communion; but who knows that he did not? Apparently he did. How many persons keep this rubric? How many clergymen enforce it? Again, it may be said that Mr. Vance Smith was not confirmed; but who knows? What clergyman is there who certifies himself concerning every communicant that he has been confirmed? It is usually quoted as an historical fact that Archbishop Secker was never confirmed, and doubts concerning the confirmation of the present Primate have caused great anxiety in some quarters. It has never been the custom of the Church of England to administer confirmation to persons who have already been communicants in other Churches. We have a continuous comment in history in evidence of this. William III., George I., and George II., were never confirmed in the Church of England, and in our own day there is the case of the late Prince Consort, to whom no bishop ever refused the sacrament of the

Supper. Even the 'blessed Martyr,' Charles I., was never confirmed.* The argument from the use of the Nicene Creed is already answered. Its recital is not an essential part of the Communion Service, and when the recommendations of the Ritual Commissioners become law, it will not even be a necessary appendage.

The Dean of Westminster was right in every way that it is possible for a man to be right. To have refused the Communion to Mr. Vance Smith would have been to have violated the law of the Church, which is also the law of the land, and to have subjected himself to the penalty of a law-breaker. The responsibility, on the other hand, of receiving the sacrament rests with the recipient, who, so far as the act goes, is thereby a member of the Church. Mr. Vance Smith has been blamed by Nonconformists as much, probably, as the Dean of Westminster has been blamed by Churchmen, which is not surprising; for, as Canon Blakesley said in reference to another subject, Nonconformist human nature is very much like Church human nature. It is the same humanity, with its good and its evil, its strength and its weakness, which runs through all. Occasional conformity to the Church of England is an ancient grief both to Conformists and Nonconformists. After the Act of Uniformity, the ejected ministers in the City of London held a meeting, at which they resolved to continue to receive the sacrament at their parish churches. Richard Baxter and many of his brethren did this to their lives' end. Toleration came in with the Prince

* A friend has since discovered in Holmes's Chronicle a record of the confirmation of Charles I.—X.

of Orange, but the Test Acts remained. It then became difficult to determine, when a Nonconformist attended the sacrament, whether his object was to conform as far as he could or only to qualify himself for a public office. In 1697 a Presbyterian Lord Mayor went to St. Paul's in the morning to receive the communion, and in the afternoon to Pinners' Hall with the sword of office carried before him. To the rigid Churchman and the stern Dissenter of that day, this was a desecration and a profanation more awful than the presence of a Unitarian at the Westminster Communion. The voice loudest in condemnation was that of Daniel De Foe; but the Lord Mayor was defended by Viscount Barrington, a leader among the Presbyterians, and by John Howe, a man whose memory is revered by all Nonconformists. Charles Leslie, on the Church side, took 'a short and easy method' with the occasional conformists, denouncing their hypocrisy, and stripping the wolves of their sheep's clothing.* The mad Church Tories, led on by the fanatic Sacheverell, tried to pass a Bill in Parliament against occasional conformity, but it was opposed by the resistless eloquence of Gilbert Burnet. Fortunately the bishops of that day were wiser than ours, and the Church of England remained the free and open Church of the nation.

We do not forget that the present question is not the occasional conformity of a mere Nonconformist, but of a Unitarian. What that name means we do not undertake to say. To define a Unitarian would be about as difficult as to explain the primal essence

* See his tract called, 'The Wolf stript of the Shepherd's Clothing'

of the universe.* That any living bishop could do either of these, we think impossible. We do not, in the present day, expect bishops to be theologians. The amount of practical work which they have to do prevents most of them having more than a merely superficial acquaintance with the great science of being, which is the science of God. This superficial knowledge makes them use indefinite words as if they were well-defined, and speak of subjects beyond the grasp of the human intellect as if they had been weighed and measured. They answer in dogmatic words the awful question which Simonides found to be more difficult to answer the more he thought of it. The Bishop of London said that 'the Catholic Church stops when we reach those who cannot believe and adore our Saviour as God.' But what is God? or in what sense was Jesus God? Until the first question is answered the second must be open to an infinity of answers. The Bishop of Gloucester alone attempted to argue the doctrinal subject against the Unitarians. He said that Unitarians are precise in rejecting the personality of the Holy Ghost. But will Dr. Ellicott define personality? Will he tell us where in the Scriptures the word 'person' is applied to the Holy Ghost? We ask even a further question: Is the word 'person' ever applied to Deity in the Scripture,

* Mr. Vance Smith, in a work since published, maintains in reference to this passage that a Unitarian can be defined. His definition is one which makes Unitarians those who affirm the Unity of God, and by inference Trinitarians are Tritheists or Polytheists. But this is begging the whole question. My meaning is, that the name Unitarian covers many different opinions, some of which are so near to the orthodox faith that the difference may be only a question of subtle metaphysics. Arians, for instance, are included under the name Unitarians, though Dr. Priestley excludes them. It is impossible that any definition of Unitarian can include both Arian and Socinian to the exclusion of Trinitarian.—X.

in any sense? The solitary passage that can be quoted is that in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which leaves us to make what we can of the indefinite word *hypostasis*, which if we translate 'person' will involve a denial of the personality of Christ. But Dr. Ellicott is peremptory. Between those who accept the Nicene Creed and those who do not, 'the gulf of difference,' he says, 'is everlasting.' We personally receive the Nicene faith as the most rational explication of Deity that has ever been given to the world; but there must be a misapprehension somewhere if we are separated by an everlasting difference from many of the ante-Nicene Fathers, and in modern times from John Milton and Sir Isaac Newton, from Samuel Clarke and Dr. Isaac Watts.

The history of theology in the Church of England bears ample witness that within the circle of those who subscribe to the Nicene Creed there may be a far wider difference concerning the Trinity than that which separates the Unitarian from the Athanasian. The Nicene Fathers, in our judgment, were the genuine disciples of Plato, or at least of the philosophical Neo-Platonists. Plato explained the Trinity as 'Being,' 'Reason,' and 'Soul,' three and yet one.* The great question between the Arian and the Athanasian was primarily a question of philosophy, and had often been discussed among the philosophers. It was whether or not the 'Reason' was co-eternal with the

* This Trinity is in Plato in various forms, but the second hypostasis is *Noûs*. The *λόγος* which St. John uses is supposed to have been borrowed from the later Platonists. Dr. Thompson, in his notes to Archer Butler's Lectures says that the *Logos* in this sense never occurs in Plato. The change in the word, however, does not affect the argument. Bishop Kidder quotes a passage in the sixth book of the 'Republic,' where he understands the *Logos* of the second person in the Trinity.

'Being'—in Christian phraseology, the Son with the Father. Arius said that there 'was (a time) when the Son was not.' 'Fool!' cried Athanasius, 'could God ever exist without his "Reason?"' Athanasius was right, and so was St. John, who said that the Logos, or 'Reason,' was in the beginning—was with God, and was God. Dr. Cudworth and the Cambridge Platonists of the seventeenth century adopted this hypothesis of the Trinity, which is really that of Scripture, of reason, and philosophy. Dr. Wallis explained how the three were one by the illustration of a cube which has three dimensions—length, breadth, and thickness. Dr. South adopted a similar hypothesis, making the three persons three modifications of the one Being. Bishop Fowler said the Son and the Holy Ghost had not an absolute existence, but derived life and eternity from the Father. Dr. Sherlock said that the three persons were as distinct as Peter, James, and John, but they were one by a mutual self-consciousness. Joseph Bingham followed Sherlock, and both were condemned by the University of Oxford as teaching that there were three Gods. The three persons were described by Sherlock as three distinct minds. They were one by each knowing the thoughts of the other—a hypothesis which would make as many persons in the Godhead as there are mutually conscious minds, and which might lead us to hope that, after the lapse of ages, the absolute consciousness of the universe may be evoked, and all thinking souls eternally blended in the One.

But this is philosophy. The old Unitarian did not like it. He was jealous for the personality and the unity of God. He supposed that in worshipping the Son we dis-

honoured the Father. He supposed that we worshipped a man as God, which is doubtless true of many Trinitarians. Our first conceptions of Deity of necessity take a human form. The old Unitarian did not escape this. It is not even evident that he tried to do it. He simply transferred the worship of the Son as man to the Father as man. The first person in John Bidle's Trinity—for he really taught a Trinity—was the Father, who was distinctly a corporeal being; the second was the Son, who was the Son of God in virtue of His miraculous conception by the Holy Ghost; and the Holy Ghost was 'a person' in the Bishop of Gloucester's sense of 'person.'

The modern Unitarian would repudiate the theology of John Bidle as heartily as we do that of the Bishop of Rochester. The miraculous birth of Jesus some of them would deny altogether, and those who did this are just those who would come nearest to the philosophical theology of St. Athanasius. They would admit, as Athanasius did, that the eternal 'Reason,' or Logos, is in all men, but that it was supremely in the man Christ Jesus. To Him the Logos was given without measure, so that He, in a most definite and distinct sense, is very God, and, as God, to be worshipped. The old Unitarians did not refuse to worship Christ even with their imperfect views of His divinity. There are tracts on this subject in the series published by Thomas Firmin, and some Unitarians in the present day use our collects in which there is direct prayer to Jesus Christ.*

* A Unitarian minister sends to the present writer the following note:—

'In June, 1870, the Rev. Alexander Gordon, M.A., of Liverpool (successor of Mr. Martineau) preached a sermon (since published—not 'by request,' however) before the Provincial Assembly of Lancashire and Cheshire (an old

It is generally supposed that Unitarians deny the Atonement. But this is only true in the sense that they deny many theories of the Atonement which have been rejected by some of the greatest divines of the Church of England. They deny the hypothesis of the Schoolmen that God demanded an infinite satisfaction, and they refuse to take literally all the figures under which the work of Christ is set forth by the New Testament writers. The Racovian Catechism says that 'Christ, by the Divine will and purpose, suffered for our sins, and underwent a bloody death as an expiatory sacrifice.' On this subject there are doubtless different views among Unitarians, as there are in the Church of England. Bishop Burnet repudiated most of the scholastic theories concerning satisfaction, and John Locke was wisely satisfied to believe that Christ was his Redeemer, leaving the manner of redemption among those things which we shall know when in ages to come we shall have learned more of God. According to Bishop Burnet the work of Dr. William Outram on the Sacrifice of Christ contained the doctrine generally received by the clergy in his day. Outram says a great deal

Presbyterian assembly dating from the Commonwealth) in which he advocated prayer to Christ, said that it was time to break through the Unitarian custom of *not* praying to Christ, and concluded with the collect for the Third Sunday after Advent, 'O Lord Jesu Christ,' which was published at the end of the Sermon. Mr. Gordon, who is a humanitarian, has also declared his belief in the profound philosophical and theological truths of the Athanasian Creed. The prayer to Christ seems to have excited no protest at the assembly.'

Mr. Gordon wrote to the Editor of the *Contemporary Review* that this note was incorrect. He did not, he said, in *that* sermon advocate prayer to Christ, and he never declared his belief in the philosophical truths of the Athanasian Creed. I have seen the sermon, in which prayer to Christ, in some sense, is certainly advocated. But for my argument it is quite enough that there have been Unitarians who have prayed to Christ.

about sacrifice, expiation, and propitiation; but the words are larger than the meaning. The Atonement is explained as not having been effected by the blood of Christ, but only that God was pleased with the obedience and sufferings of His Son. The Unitarians of Burnet's day were willing to receive Outram's work as in the main expressing their views.

We have tried to determine how near a Unitarian may come to the theology of the Church of England. We have shown that he may be often nearer than some who are of the Church of England. It is possible, then, that Mr. Vance Smith may be separated from us only by some little difference that should be relegated altogether to the region of speculative theology. The position of the Unitarians of the present day does not seem to be so much the defence of Unitarian dogmas as the advocacy of practical religion, and the necessity of letting in light from whatever quarter it comes. They are asking the Church of England to do the same, and that is only asking the Church of England to be what it professes to be—not a Church of dogmas and metaphysical creeds, but of practical religion. This is the Church's ideal, which we cannot but believe will one day be realised. The recent exhibition in the Upper House of Convocation is certainly humiliating, but it is doubtless due in a great measure to the absence of the Primate and the folly of some of the bishops. We may now indeed call upon our souls, and all that is within us, to unite in one rapturous *Te Deum* of thanksgiving that the Church of England is governed by the law and not by the bishops.

VIII.

REPUBLICS, CIVIL AND SOCIAL.*

ST. AUGUSTINE says, 'It is recorded of Cain that he built a city, but Abel was a pilgrim, and built none. For the city of the saints is above, though it has citizens here upon earth, in which it lives as a pilgrim till the time of the kingdom come, and then it will gather all the citizens together in the resurrection body, and give them a kingdom in which they will reign with their King for ever and ever.' In another place Augustine calls the two cities represented by Cain and Abel two mystical cities. The one is the city of them that do evil, the other is the dwelling of the just. But if the cities are 'mystical,'

* Contemporary Review, July, 1871.

PLATO'S *Republic*.

ARISTOTLE'S *Politics*.

CICERO, *De Republica*.

ST. AUGUSTINE, *De Civitate Dei*.

DE QUINCEY on the *Essenes*.

SIR THOMAS MORE'S *Utopia*.

HOBBS' *Leviathan*.

HARRINGTON'S *Oceana*.

THE WORKS OF FOURIER, ST. SIMON, and ROBERT OWEN.

SARGANT'S *Social Innovators*.

Les Moines d'Occident. Par le COMTE DE MONTALEMBERT.

W. H. DIXON'S *New America*.

Hand-book of the Oneida Community. By J. H. NOYES. Wallingford, Connecticut. 1867.

History of American Socialisms. By J. H. NOYES. Trübner & Co. 1870.

they are not concrete ; that is, they are not cities in the ordinary sense of being situated in definite places. They are properly invisible, or cities cognisable only in their members, and in the principles by which their members are guided. It is, then, by a figure of speech that any earthly city, such as Rome or Babylon, is called the city of the wicked. Still more is it a figure to speak of any given community as the city of God.

But if the city of God is constituted by principles, and by members acting on these principles, it may exist more or less in any earthly city. A number of the citizens may be members of the heavenly city, or the government itself may be just, and therefore so far penetrated by the spirit which constitutes the kingdom of God. It is clear, even from Augustine's illustration, that no secular city in itself is the anti-thesis of the city of God. The world, simply as the world, is not the antagonist of the Church. It is rather the battle-field for the contending forces of good and evil. The children of Seth and Noah built cities as well as the children of Cain.

Plato treats of government or politics proper in the 'Laws ;' but in the 'Republic' we have his ideal of a civil commonwealth, the embodiment of his idea of the city of God. The 'Republic' might be described as a scheme of education, a mode of training the people to a sense of justice, grounded in the conviction that justice in the widest sense is the true welfare, not of individuals only, but of nations. The analogy which he works out is between the perfect man and the perfect state. He introduces Socrates

discoursing of justice, and its harmony, to use a modern phrase, with the constitution of man. Thrasy-machus argues, that whatever is expedient for the established government is justice. Whatever the powerful do to support themselves, that is just. Socrates, on the other side, proves that what is just is expedient both for the governed and for them that rule. The old Bible question of the present prosperity of the wicked is answered as the Bible answers it. The inequality in God's ways is not real, but only apparent. Men who are unjust, and yet prosperous, are compared to the runners in a race, who do well at the first starting, but lose in the end, and become objects of compassion and ridicule. Socrates maintains that this is essentially true both with men and states. The exceptions are few, if indeed there are any real exceptions. He adds, too, the consideration of a future judgment, when the judges shall put the just on their right hand and the unjust on the left; the one to go upwards, and the other downwards. The poets were to be excluded from the Republic because of their unworthy representations of the gods; in other words, the influence of the mythology was reckoned evil. Such deities as were found in Homer and Hesiod were not to be worshipped. The people were to be so well instructed in righteousness, that is, in what is right both as to body and spirit, that they were to require neither magistrates nor physicians. So far Plato's 'Republic' was a city of God.

But Plato has to deal with men, women, and children as they are, not as he intends them to be. He has to meet the facts of human life. Man is by

nature a selfish being. He seeks first of all his own interests. As an individual, or as a member of society, he may covet the goods of other individuals or of other societies. This may be the occasion of war. Hence arises the necessity of guardians, that is, a military class, or soldiers. Husbandmen may plough the fields and find sustenance for themselves and their families. Artificers may earn by their craft the means of existence. But this necessity for a military class is a heavy tax on the resources of the commonwealth. It was for them alone that special social arrangements were to be made. They required food, clothes, lodging. All these they were to have in common. Being provided with these, there was no need that they should have individual property. But the community being divided into three classes, this third included women as well as men. It would be easy to provide for men only; but the number of women that come into the world is equal to that of men. This fact in nature has always perplexed the politician and the moralist wherever the necessity has existed for a standing army. Plato proposed that the women should be trained to warfare as well as the men; that the military class should have their wives in common; that healthy children should be brought up as the children of the State, but those that were not likely to be physically strong were to be destroyed. There were two difficulties to be met—the necessity of a military class, and what to do with their children. Plato meets them as they would have been met by Cain, or by the people of the city which Cain built.

Aristotle criticizes Plato's 'Republic' with his usual sagacity. He finds that the family is the first society established by nature. Families unite for mutual help, and make a village. Several villages form a city or state. In this state there are slaves, women and children, whom it is necessary to instruct in virtue. There must be some things in common, as, for instance, the city in which they live. It is desirable that the city be as much as possible one. Yet it cannot be one so entirely as Plato maintains. It would not then be a city. Moreover, Plato's scheme of a community of goods and wives would not bring about the unity which he proposes. Men have a special care of what is specially their own. If the community of wives were a mere matter of policy, it ought to be allowed to husbandmen and artificers even more than to soldiers. It would help to prevent them uniting too closely against the guardians of the state. But it is injurious to every party; and, therefore, to the commonwealth. Children would lose the benefit of parental care and affection. In case of quarrels, a son might inflict a blow on his father. If property were common, there would be no room for the exercise of such virtues as charity and benevolence. A community of wives would destroy that modesty which is the peculiar grace of woman. The evils which Plato finds in existing states are not due, Aristotle says, to the fact of private property, but to the natural corruption of mankind. In the 'Laws' Plato proposed limiting every man's property according to a fixed plan. Aristotle answers that, if so, there must also be a limit fixed for his children. There may be

equality, and yet luxury. There may also be equality, and not a sufficiency to support the community.

The Bible deals with the same problems as those which occupied the minds of the Greeks. Abraham left Ur of the Chaldees to seek a city. He sought a purer worship, and with that a purer morality. His descendants were established in Canaan, under the government of Jehovah. Their state was a theocracy, a city of God. We need not here discuss the question how far and in what it differed from other states. The Bible never says that the heathen nations were not under the divine protection. Jehovah, the God of the Jews, was not the God of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles. If the kingdoms of the earth were established and maintained by force, the same might be said of the kingdom of David and Solomon. The Jews' theocracy was only an earthly Canaan. The saints were but pilgrims, still looking for a city of God. Jerusalem was the type, the temporal emblem of that mystical city. Every deep yearning of the Jew was towards Jerusalem. His patriotism and his religious ardour alike centred in the capital of his country. Mount Zion was beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth. 'Glorious things,' the psalmist exclaims, 'are spoken of thee, O city of God.'

The kingdom was rent asunder in the days of Jeroboam. The ten tribes were carried beyond the Euphrates by Shalmaneser. A like fate befell the two remaining tribes under Nebuchadnezzar. Captive Judah wept by the waters of Babylon, but in the darkest hour of her sorrow she looked for a city of God. 'Thy King cometh,'¹ was the joy of the daughter

of Zion. The weeping exiles saw this glorious city as Jerusalem restored, when its prosperity would be so abundant that the most feeble would find protection—‘the old men and old women’ dwelling in the streets, and ‘the city full of boys and girls playing in the streets thereof.’

In the time of the Babylonian Captivity the brute forces of the world were in the tide of their triumph. The four empires of the visions of Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel—the Babylonian, the Grecian, the Medo-Persian, and the Roman—were founded in injustice and oppression. To philosopher and saint, to the thoughtful Greek and the devout Jew, the conviction was deep that these monarchies must yield to governments founded on equity. Daniel saw thrones cast down, and ‘the Ancient of days did sit,’ and one like unto ‘the Son of Man’ came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the ‘Ancient of days.’ To the ‘Son of man’ was given an everlasting kingdom. After the Roman comes the kingdom of heaven, the city of God, the everlasting dominion of the Son of man.

In the days of Herod, when the Roman Empire had reached the culmination of its greatness, came John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness of Judea, saying, ‘Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.’ John connected this kingdom with the King who was to come, the Anointed One, the Messiah, the Christ. After John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God. What did He mean by this kingdom? Was He to establish a new Republic? Was He, like Moses and Plato, to give laws for the guidance of a

Commonwealth? To this conclusion we shall certainly come if we forget that the city of the good, as well as the city of the evil, is a 'mystical' city. A perfect commonwealth may have been expected by the Jews, and longed for by the nations, but it was not necessarily implied in the words 'kingdom of God.' The idea of Jesus was the same in kind as the idea of Socrates and Plato. He was to found secular governments on justice. He was to introduce into the world the reign of the meek and lowly, the peace-makers, and those who hunger and thirst after righteousness. Did Daniel take it in this sense? Perhaps he did, probably he did not. It matters nothing. He may have connected it with a universal visible kingdom, as other Jews connected it with the restoration of Jerusalem. The kingdom which Jesus preached was not to come with observation. He told the Pharisees, demanding an external sign, that the kingdom was among them. It had come unseen by them. In a series of parables Jesus explains this kingdom. It is good seed sowed in a field. It is a grain of mustard seed which grew to be a great tree. It is leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened. It is a treasure hid in a field. It is the pearl of great price. In all these parables the kingdom is a principle rather than a society of men. The last of the series seems to take in the idea of a visible society, but then it is a society both of good and bad. It is a net which 'gathered of every kind.' It is not a realised city of God, but a society professing to follow the principles which constitute the city of God, and which are yet to leaven the world.

It is said in the Acts of the Apostles, that after the accession of the three thousand souls, 'all that believed were together, and had all things common.' They had ceased to value property. Perhaps they believed that the end of the world was not far off. Beyond this brief notice, we know nothing of the communist life of the first Christians. De Quincey supposes that the Essenes mentioned by Josephus were the Christians. The argument is, that Josephus, who says nothing of the Christians, yet describes these Essenes in words which identify them with the Christians. They had all one patrimony. When they travelled they carried nothing with them, finding in the hospitality of their brethren all that was necessary. 'just as if it were their own.' They neglected wedlock, without absolutely denying the fitness of marriage. They were peace-makers, and 'eminent for fidelity.' Now St. Paul allows marriage, that is, tolerates it. But for himself, and for the Christians generally of that time and in their circumstances, he regards it as an evil. They that have wives are exhorted to be as though they had none. It is more than probable that the first Christians became a body of communists such as the Essenes were, if the Essenes really were not the Christians. The records which we have of the heretics of the first ages are imperfect, and mostly from their enemies. Yet there are many things which, fairly interpreted, seem to prove that they were communists and celibates. They misunderstood the mission of Christianity and its relation to the world. A representative sect was the philosophical Manichees, who did despite not

to the Spirit, but to the flesh. They could see nothing of God in the purely secular. The world was the work of the devil, and therefore to be hated and despised. They looked upon nature as we are all sometimes tempted to look upon it, as essentially impure. Manicheism is an error found in all Churches and among all philosophers. It is an error natural to men who have known the conflict of good and evil in themselves, and who have confounded the forces of evil with the world of nature in which they met these forces. Some men cannot realise the city of God but as something absolutely apart from the city of the world.

Augustine's conception of Christianity was far from perfect, yet his 'De Civitate Dei' is a luminous exposition of the principles of the city of God. Rome had fallen under Alaric and the Goths. The fourth beast, 'dreadful and terrible and strong exceedingly,' was now subdued. Romulus, the founder of Rome, like the typical city-builder, slew his brother—

'Fraterno primi maduerunt sanguine muri.'

The first citizens of Rome were robbers, stealing from the Sabines even the women that were to be the mothers of the future Romans. The city became great by plunder. Cicero once said that if the Romans were to give every man his own, they would have to leave their palaces and return to their huts. When this nation of robbers was finally conquered, the pagans charged the calamity on the Christians. They said that the gods had forsaken Rome because the Romans had ceased to worship the gods. This

gave Augustine occasion to discourse of the principles by which Rome existed, of the pagan deities, and of the Christian religion. The claim which Virgil made for Rome, that it was her glory

‘Parcere subjectis, et debellare superbos,’

Augustine called one of the attributes which belong only to the city of God. He says that according to the definition of a commonwealth in Cicero’s ‘Republic,’ Rome never had a true commonwealth. It never was the ‘estate of the people.’ It never was governed by justice. Its laws were but decrees for the benefit of those that governed, and not laws grounded in right and reason. He puts in contrast the city of Rome and the city of God, yet he never speaks of the ‘city of God’ as a visible community. It is not any of the commonwealths of the world, neither is it an ecclesiastical organization. It is the ‘mystical’ city of the regenerate, or the elect. It is not denied that the Romans had some great virtues. It is not denied that the philosophers discovered some truth. It is even said that this was done by the grace of God. From this statement we might argue that, in St. Augustine’s judgment, the philosophers and virtuous pagans were citizens of the ‘city of God.’

The object of the heavenly city is to regenerate earthly cities; not to teach men to flee from the world, but to enable them to live justly in the world. In this sense we have put Plato’s ‘Republic’ among the efforts to realise the city of God. Plato’s ‘Republic’ probably suggested Sir Thomas More’s ‘Utopia.’ Sir

Thomas More is not reckoned among our reformers ; but he was a reformer, and, judging from this book, more than an ordinary one. The discourse is put into the lips of Raphael Hythloday, a Portuguese, who had been in three or four voyages with Americus Vesputius. Sir Thomas More is in Belgium as ambassador to Henry VIII., and meets Raphael in the town of Antwerp. They discourse of the evils of existing governments, of the disposition of princes to go to war rather than cultivate the useful arts of peace. Raphael had been in England in his youth, and had been entertained by Cardinal Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury, in whose family Sir Thomas More was 'bred from his childhood.' Raphael says that dining one day with the Archbishop, a lawyer who was present expressed his surprise that there were so many thieves in England, notwithstanding so many were hung that sometimes twenty might be seen suspended from one gibbet. On this Raphael took occasion to say that it did not surprise him ; for the people of England were like many other people, more ready to chastise scholars than to teach them. He recommended making provision by which men could find the means of existence as more 'beneficial than enacting dreadful punishments against thieves.' He discoursed further of the prodigality and luxury of the nobles and landowners, who oppressed their tenants and labourers, grinding the faces of the poor, to support a multitude of idle persons to attend on them. In France Raphael said things were even worse, for that country was full of soldiers ; the people 'sometimes seek occasion for making war that

they may train up their soldiers in the art of cutting throats, or, as Sallust observed, for keeping their hands in use.' He points out to the Cardinal the evils arising from the enclosure of lands for pasture, the destruction of towns and villages that formerly lived by agriculture; even 'those holy men the abbots, not contented with the rent their farms yielded, stop the course of agriculture, enclose grounds, reserving only the churches, that they may lodge sheep in them.' The labourers were driven forth to beg or starve, or live as they best could. It was proposed that all beggars should be sent to monasteries, a grave ecclesiastic wittily remarking that this would not relieve them of beggars so long as the friars existed.

After a long conversation on the manifold evils of society, Raphael declares himself for Plato's doctrine of a community of goods. He says that the only way to make people happy is to make them all equal. He proves this from his experience of seven years among the Utopians in the island of Utopia, where the science of government had reached perfection. The island had fifty-four cities. Farmhouses were built all over the country, and the inhabitants were sent out from the cities by turns to dwell in them. Every country family was a community, consisting of not less than forty men and women, with two slaves. It had a master and mistress set over it, and over every thirty families there was a magistrate. Every inhabitant of the island was instructed in agriculture. They had reached great perfection in rearing crops, breeding cattle, and hatching chickens. The last was done by

collecting a vast number of eggs and placing them in an equal heat. They had no strong drinks, no luxuries, but an abundance of necessaries for all. They had no idle women, no idle priests or 'religious men,' no rich men, and no beggars. When the women married they went to the houses of their husbands, but the men continued in the houses of their fathers and grandfathers. The women served their husbands, children served their parents, and the younger children the elder. They despised money, preferring that which money represented. They valued iron, because useful above more precious metals. Their soup-basins and their drinking bowls were made of earthenware, but their 'vessels of dishonour' were of gold and silver.* Their children wore ornaments until they were old enough to put away childish things. They defined virtue as living according to nature. They governed their passions, and they called that piety which preferred another's interest to their own. They did not allow polygamy. Their religion was a rational Theism, but all sects were tolerated. The community was happy, at peace in their minds, and enjoying entire health, which in itself they reckoned the greatest of all pleasures.

Lerminier says that one day in the first year of the French Republic, Condorcet was developing to his friends, with that enthusiasm which accompanied him through life, the social consequence of the revolution. 'But,' said one of his hearers, 'you go beyond Rousseau.' 'Without doubt,' he replied boldly ;

* For the meaning of this see Notes on Rheimes New Testament, Romans ix. 21.

‘Rousseau made the philosophy of the eighteenth century; I make that of the nineteenth.’ Condorcet saw in the revelations of physical science discoveries which would, he expected, in a few generations change the whole conditions of society. Famine would be unknown, and human life would be protracted to a duration almost rivalling that ascribed to the patriarchs. Science was to introduce for humanity the golden age of the future.

Condorcet did little more than make suggestions and prophecies. He was followed by others who made Socialism a religion, a philosophy, and a science. We cannot enter into the details of the transcendental theories of Charles Fourier. They were extravagant and fantastical, yet founded on some plain facts and some obvious truths. He saw harmony in the universe, but man not in harmony with the universe; and this he ascribed to the free will of man, which, acting in ignorance, gave human life an impulse contrary to the divine impulse. Philosophers and moralists had taught hitherto that some instincts are good and some bad; that some therefore are to be developed, and others suppressed. But the instincts which we call bad are as indelible, Fourier says, and of as high an origin as those which we call good. They must have a place in the general harmony. Their existence ought to be a blessing, and not a curse. Society should be constituted so that all persons be brought into harmony with the universal order. Man is regarded as the miniature or image of the Great Being. The divinely-inspired passions are said to be thwarted in their development by the

present conditions of society. We suppress that which is divine instead of changing that which is human.

Fourier's remedy was to reconstruct society on what he called rational and philosophical principles. He was to abolish single families with all family instincts. He was to introduce communities in which all might have but one interest, where all rivalry in business might end, and the natural loves of humanity be innocently enjoyed without the base admixture of self-interest. The communities were called *phalanges*. Each was to consist of 1,800 persons of different ages. A community was to live in a palace called the *phalanstère*. Fourier gives in detail the amount of land to be allotted to each community. He gives plans of workshops and gardens. He shows how the fields are to be cultivated, and how all are to share the produce, while ample scope is to be given for the natural ambition of men to work for the common good.

About the time that Fourier was publishing his schemes of social regeneration, Count St. Simon was devoting himself to the same problem. The life of St. Simon is of great interest. At the Revolution he was a young man, full of the new hopes that had just been born into the world. After some experience as a soldier under Washington, he returned to France, and gave himself entirely to the regeneration of society. He began by educating himself. He had been a soldier, and now he became a merchant. Retiring with a realised fortune, he wished to become a *savant*. He studied the physical sciences. He opened his

house to astronomers, physicians, and mathematicians. He visited England and Germany, to make the acquaintance of learned men and philosophers. He tried to put himself in every situation of human life, that others might benefit from his experience. To complete his scientific education he entered into the married state, wishing to leave no condition of life untried, or to be a stranger to any emotions, good or bad, virtuous or vicious. His biographer says that when he ended his studies he had also ended his fortune. He began to write books, but no publishers would publish them without being secured against loss. He lived on bread and water, and, in winter, without fuel. At one time he tried suicide, but the ball missed its aim.

The time of St. Simon's public activity is divided into two periods. The first was purely scientific, having no reference to religion, but entirely secular in its objects. During this epoch the world refused to listen. The second begins with the publication of a book, which he called 'New Christianity.' In this book he connected his scheme of social regeneration with the progress of the 'Church of the Future,' which was to embrace both Catholics and Protestants, and to be more Catholic than any Church had yet been. He set aside dogmas. He said that the Church of Rome had become heretical ever since it had ceased to take the lead in science. The first and essential point of religion was love to man. Realising this, we should endeavour above all things to ameliorate the moral and physical existence of the human race. That this was the primary object of Christianity, St. Simon

thinks is proved by the universal expectation of a Messianic era, when all things should become new. It is admitted that Luther effected a great reformation. But he should have reorganized society as well as religion. He should have said less about a heavenly paradise, and tried more to show men how a paradise could be found on earth. Civilisation owes a debt of gratitude to Luther. But he stood in the way of progress, by reducing worship to simple preaching, thus dispensing with the powerful services of orators, poets, painters, architects, and musicians. St. Simon supposed that Christianity originally reprobated the merely secular—that it identified matter, or the ‘flesh,’ with evil; and that it separated between the kingdom of heaven and this world. Humanity’s hope for the future, he said, is in putting honour on all which Christianity has reprobated as the world and the flesh. In the Church of the latter day man is to feel and realise the divinity of his whole nature, material as well as spiritual. Antagonism of every kind is to cease. Man is no longer to be the slave of man; the privileges of birth and fortune are to be abolished. Men will be classed and rewarded according to their capacities and their labours. The spirit will no longer strive against the flesh, nor the flesh against the spirit. The strife will be ended by the perfectly-developed harmony of man’s nature. Peace shall rule the world. Swords shall be beaten into ploughshares, and spears into pruning-hooks. The earth shall be the main object of cultivation. It will undergo incredible transformations; and man shall make continual progress in knowledge, in riches,

and in love. A great part of St. Simon's scheme is identical with Fourier's. Its results are to be the equality of women with men, the dissolvability of marriage, a common home for children, the annihilation of all distinctions between employers and employed. Instead of masters and merchants, there will be functionaries of agriculture, of industry, and of commerce, who will have salaries in proportion to the work they accomplish.

Mr. Noyes has furnished us with a history of these schemes in the phase of experiments. Though nearly all of them have been failures, Mr. Noyes is convinced that Socialism itself is not a failure, but that it has taken deep root in the American soil, and is full of promise for the future of humanity. The history of Robert Owen's settlement, called the New Harmony, is well known. There were some things connected with its constitution and management which were sufficient in themselves to account for failure. The next one of special interest among those which failed is 'Brook Farm.' It was the offspring of the latest development of American Unitarianism. But, according to Mr. Noyes, it passed finally into Fourierism. The idea originated with Channing, but the prime worker was George Ripley. It numbered among its members Theodore Parker, Margaret Fuller, Elizabeth Peabody, and, for a time, Nathaniel Hawthorne. They made agriculture the basis of life. Ripley carted manure, and Hawthorne benevolently handled the shovel. Some one, with no taste for rural occupations, described them as having become 'chambermaids to the cows.' Miss Peabody, on the other hand, with a deep sense of

the poetry of existence, spoke of the true life as aiming beyond the highest star, yet 'redolent of the healthy earth.' 'The perfume of clover,' she said, 'lingers about it. The lowing of cattle is the natural bass to the melody of human voices.' Emerson smiled incredulously at the project. Hawthorne has described it as a 'romantic episode,' a 'picnic;' but Miss Peabody caught the true spirit of its originators. In *The Dial*, which was published at the 'Farm,' she explained it as an effort to establish upon earth the city of God. While admitting that the Church of the first ages of Christianity was a great advance on the previous institutions, she could not believe that it realised the ideal of human society which was in the mind of Jesus. The kingdom of heaven and the Christian Church were not something outside of society, but a reorganization of society itself on the principles of love to God and love to man—the principle with Jesus realised in His own daily life. Miss Peabody added, 'Perhaps Jesus' method of thought and life is the Saviour, is Christianity. For each man to think and live on this method is, perhaps, the Second Coming of Christ. To do unto the little ones as we would do unto Him would be, perhaps, the reign of the saints—the kingdom of heaven.' Again, 'We have hitherto heard of Christ by the hearing of the ear; now let us see Him, let us be Him, and see what will come of that. Let us communicate with each other and live.'

The society of American Communists which has prospered beyond all others is that of the Shakers. Their settlement on Mount Lebanon, as described by Mr. Dixon, is an Eden of blessedness. They are the

followers of Ann Lee, a religious enthusiast, who was originally a factory operative in Lancashire. By a Divine revelation, she and her followers were warned to leave England, and seek the land of promise beyond the Atlantic. They are then pre-eminently a religious community. They believe that the kingdom of heaven has come, that Christ has actually appeared on earth for the second time, and that the personal rule of God has been restored. Neither birth nor death exists for them. They neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are the children of the Resurrection. What is called death is but the shedding of the visible robe of the flesh for an invisible glory of the spirit. Their great work in the world is their warfare against concupiscence. By it man fell from heaven, and by its destruction will he rise to heaven again. Generation, they say, is the great foe to regeneration. The saints, therefore, do not dare to increase the empire of sin and death. Phædra said to Hippolytus :

‘ Si Venerem tollas, rustica sylva tua est ;’

but the Shaker community is happy and prosperous. They live long in health and wealth. The voices of merry boys and laughing girls ring over their green-swards, and young men and maidens enjoy love without lust, knowing no unions but the unions of the soul and the blendings of the spiritual life.

Mr. Noyes is the head of the Oneida Community, which he connects with the Finney Revivals. One of the things which he undertakes to prove in his book is the necessity of the religious element for the success of Socialism. Referring to Owen's schemes, he says

that the Revivalists failed for want of the regeneration of society, and the Socialists for want of regeneration of heart. The religious principles of the Oneida Community are a mixture of revelation and divination. They also believe that the second advent is already past, that the kingdom of heaven has come ; and, therefore, the ordinance of marriage is abolished. In the Oneida Community love is free to all ages. Care, however, is taken to limit the increase of the population. The mode of doing this is explained in the 'Hand-Book,' but Mr. Noyes omits it in his 'History.' We omit it here.

The Mormons are also a religious community, though their chief faith seems to be in Ovid, who says :—

'Jupiter esse pium statuit quodcunque juvaret.'

While on both continents the question was being discussed if every man could support a wife and children, the Mormons demonstrated that by industry and simplicity of life every man in a community might support many wives and many children. Driven from their homes and their possessions, and settling without resources in an apparently barren country, by the Christianity of their muscles they have made a desert to smile and a wilderness to blossom. While in England the proportion of women over men makes it hard for many women to live ; and while in America the scarcity of women has set on foot all manner of questions as to the rights and capacities of women, the Mormons neither find a lack of wives nor any difficulty in keeping them in subjection to their husbands. Mr. Dixon tells us that Brigham Young charges his

missionaries when he sends them forth to convert the Gentiles, not to return without bringing with them 'young lambs for the fold.'

All these communities, whether in theory or in actual existence, from Plato's 'Republic' to the last of the American Socialisms, are connected with questions which concern the daily life of every man and every commonwealth. They are Church questions, State questions, and Church-and-State questions. We have interpreted the Christian Church as an effort to realise upon earth the kingdom of God. By a figure of speech it is the kingdom of God. This distinction is important. Half the errors of theology arise from confounding figures with realities. If the professing Christian Church had been really the kingdom of God, it would have had some distinct notes of perfection. It would have retained its unity. It would have been infallible. Its officers would have possessed all the power which the priests of Rome say they possess. There would have been no ground for dispute between different societies of Christians which of them was the Church. Accused before Pilate of making Himself a king, Jesus answered, 'My kingdom is not of this world.' He was not a temporal king, such as the Jews expected, and such as the Romans feared. But He did establish a society. He gave the Apostles the keys of this society, which meant that they were to exercise government. Was His kingdom then, after all, a kingdom of this world? Did this kingdom depend on a succession of Church officers? The Church of Rome consistently and logically adheres to this doctrine. But when any Christians admit the possibility

of two Christian Churches with a wall of separation between them, by that very admission they are compelled to say that the visible Church is not the kingdom of God. If Christ's institution of a society destined to be one through all time is the right interpretation of His words and acts, then there can be but one community, and that community, to preserve its continuity and identity, should, like the Church of the Apostles, have all things in common. If the State were perfect, and the Church perfect, their union would follow by necessity. They would then be, to use Hooker's words, 'personally one society.' This ideal unity, this necessity for a perfect commonwealth founded in righteousness, is the philosophy of the arguments of Coleridge, Arnold, and Stanley, for the Church and State union.

But the questions raised by these communities touch the very springs of existence. Mr. Darwin's natural law of struggle for life prevails among men as well as among plants and beasts. Nature is bountiful; yet she gives but little to man without labour. Of the thousands of children daily born into the world not one-half can receive the care and sustenance necessary to continue their existence. The great multitude of men have to work hard merely to live. It is the chief business of human life for men to provide for themselves and their children. Many cannot do even this, and only a few can do more. Are we to believe that Nature produces more men than she provides for? that here, as in the lower orders of creation, there is a surplus whose doom, in a state of nature, is to be food for other animals? or is the imperfection due to a

vicious constitution of society? There exist doubtless inequality, waste, and, from the fluctuations of commerce, uncertainty. An increase of trade in any district is always followed by an increase of population. A momentary cessation of business leaves multitudes in destitution. Even if the scale of provision and population be in the main fairly balanced by Nature, the necessities of society cause the provision side to strike the beam. Man has many desires by nature, and many more by habit, which intensify the struggle for human life. He wants to enjoy existence. Nature's object is simply to continue existence. Throughout all her kingdom the continuation of life is her first aim; not the life of individuals, as such, but life itself. From the individual she demands labour and sacrifice to preserve the race—

‘So careful of the type she seems,
So lavish of the single life.’

The question of communist societies is in reality but another phase of the question of civil government. The problem is, how to substitute a common good for a merely individual good. It may be that all the socialistic schemes are not only impracticable, but fundamentally wrong. It may be that the life and energy of commerce are dependent on individual enterprise, which supposes individual wealth as the primary motive. But granting this, the question turns up again in the wider circle of civil government—Can there be communities founded on equity, and not on force? Is man naturally a savage, must he ever be a savage, or is it possible that civilisation in any true sense will yet be the uniting bond of human

society? It is evident from all history that both amongst Jews and Heathens there were aspirations and strivings after higher forms of government than existed in their times. Might reigned, and its reign was terrible. The Jewish theocracy, as well as the Greek and Roman Republics, were the expressions of the aspirations of the people to be freed from the dominion of force; but by force they were overthrown. Jesus was no revolutionist, yet the kingdom which He established was meant to revolutionise the world. His idea was that of Daniel—a kingdom of the Son of man, to succeed the kingdoms which make war with each other. The assumption by the Bishop of Rome of authority over kings and kingdoms may have been a perverted, yet certainly it was not an unnatural application of the Messianic idea. But the authority claimed by the Popes became the same in kind as the authority of princes. The history of centuries preceding the Reformation was but the history of the great struggle for power between the Bishops of Rome and secular princes. The Popes prevailed, but their reign was not the reign of righteousness. In the sixteenth century the divine right of kings was substituted for the divine right of the Bishops of Rome.

But the divine right of kings was frail. Their kingdoms had been established by force. Revolutions came. New dynasties arose, and their divine right, too, was acknowledged. It was but the divine right of force. The ideas of Jesus have revolutionised men and nations; yet apparently they have failed even to influence the principles on which civil states exist. The dualism between the Church and the world is still

unreconciled. Few men who believe in progress could have believed that the recent war between France and Germany was possible at the present stage of European civilisation. But it originated with that very nation which has been fruitful in schemes for regeneration, which has longed after a Republic, but which has never understood what 'an estate of the people' really meant. The fall of the Third Napoleon might have marked a stage of progress. He was overtaken by a just retribution, and went into exile unlamented—

'Unwept, unhonoured, and unsung.'

But the sequel has given us no hope. It may be in accordance with a law not to be broken that nations have evil rulers in proportion as the people fail to understand their civil duties.

Our efforts for the regeneration of society might be hopeful if Nature herself did not present difficulties which seem as if they could never be conquered. The mere nature side gives us but little prospect of success. There is a mystery there which in and by itself is never explained. The terrible problem of the existence of evil, which seems to connect depravity inseparably with all that is finite and temporal, has led some of the wisest and best men to despair of regeneration. It is from within us that we have our hopes and aspirations. Before our minds the ideals of what may be are ever arising. In some things the ideals have been realised, and these realisations have good ground to hope for the realisation of others. The faith of Jesus seemed a faith against the apparent realities of mere nature. He believed in the regene-

ration of society when He saw it at its worst. He believed in man when man was at his vilest. Can we still believe in the regeneration of society—in the regeneration of man? In other words, can we still cling to the faith of Jesus? Can we believe that after all the world-process is really divine, that the storm will be followed by a calm, the dark clouds by the sunshine, and that we may say that when the evolution is completed the light will be manifest

‘ Gravior it dies
Et soles melius nitent ’ ?

In the meantime there are some things within our reach, if all things are not. We may not be able to prevent a famine or an earthquake, but it is within the power of man to say that the differences of nations shall be settled without the barbarous solution of ‘ fire and steel.’ It may be that the population of the world, if unchecked, would surpass its provision; but even this has never been fairly tried. Less profligacy and more prudence, less luxury and more simplicity, no standing armies, but more productive industry, might yet realise Sir Thomas More’s Utopia, or even introduce the dominion of the Son of man.

IX.

CHRISTIANITY AND MODERN EVIDENCES.*

MR. CARLYLE somewhere says that if an unbeliever is sincere he is to be pitied, and if he is not sincere he is to be pitied all the more. It is sad enough for an earnest man to have lost faith in God and eternity, but the insincere scoffer is a spectacle over whom angels might weep. If there be any satisfaction at all in the thought that there are men without faith, it is that they are sincere in their unbelief. They have strained their eyes, but have not seen. They have waited for the light, but no day has dawned. So long as they are sincere there is hope. At any rate, they have the consciousness that they have done their best. But of the scorers it may be said as the psalmist said of the ungodly, 'They are like the chaff which the wind driveth away.'

It must be some satisfaction to right-thinking Christians, as well as to unbelievers, that Christian

* Contemporary Review, September, 1871.

Modern Scepticism. A Course of Lectures delivered at the request of the Christian Evidence Society. With an Explanatory Paper by the Right Rev. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

The Witness of History to Christ. Hulsean Lectures for 1870. By the Rev. F. W. FARRAR, M.A., F.R.S. London and Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. 1871.

apologists begin to respect sincere scruples, and to sympathize with men who are troubled with doubts. The modern unbeliever must be thankful that he is no longer represented by Bolingbroke or Paine, and Christians may be equally thankful that the defence of Christianity is delivered from the ferocity of the Bentleys and the Warburtons. In reading old books on evidences it is painful to find that in order to achieve a victory over an unbeliever, it was often necessary to charge him with some immorality, to impute some bad motive for his unbelief, to misrepresent his meaning, and then to belabour him as one of the forlorn children of Belial. Of course this was the spirit of past times, and was quite in agreement with the love which militant Christians then showed to each other. The spirit of the lecturers at St. George's Hall contrasts favourably with this spirit. It shows that if Christianity does not develop, Christians do; that if the 'faith once delivered to the saints' be always the same, its defenders at least make progress in Christian virtues.

It is not to be denied that at the present time we are in the midst of a great religious crisis. The educated classes, it is said, are renouncing Christianity. Reports concerning the universities represent scepticism as widely spread among the students. The highest intellects are no longer at the service of religion, and even the clergy themselves are said to be making shipwreck of faith. Some allowance must, indeed, be made for the exaggerations to which religious people are specially prone; but it is certain that the faith which served our fathers will not, at least in

the same form, serve our children. During the last ten years we have been compelled to give up positions which we once thought were the strongholds of Christianity. We have entered on a new era, and all men are musing in their hearts what the end is to be. The subject of man's faith in God and his hopes for the future has been reopened. It is our duty to face it honestly, to make our inquiries, if we can without passion or prejudice, and not to suffer it to rest until, so far as in us lies, we have settled it once and for ever.

The first supposed enemy of religion is physical science. When Lord Bacon propounded his method of induction he was careful to say that it was not to be applied in religion. Natural knowledge only was to be derived from nature. Articles of faith were to be learned from the Scriptures. Spinoza made the same distinction, limiting the use of reason in Scripture to determining the meaning of Scripture. When the Royal Society was established it was opposed by Bishop Gunning, Bishop Barlow, and some other scholastic theologians, from a fear that the study of nature would be prejudicial to revelation. Bishop Sprat, the historian and vindicator of the Society, said that their fears were vain. The domain of nature was entirely distinct from that of revelation. Science and revelation, he said, must agree to a divorce. He added, that if the study of nature was to imperil the faith of Christians, that study must be abandoned. The theologians who opposed the Royal Society were right from their stand-point. The study of nature cannot be without an influence on our interpretation

of revelation. If the study of nature reveals facts not in accordance with the Bible records, the question is immediately raised in what sense the Bible records are to be understood. There was, however, wisdom in Bishop Sprat's proposal for at least a temporary divorce. The student of nature must be free. As a mere physical student, he has nothing to do with the physical science of the Bible. He has nothing to do, as Bacon justly said, even with final causes. He has not to inquire for what end anything exists, but simply how it exists. It is true that no well-developed mind can stop here. But when a man comes to the Bible or to teleology he becomes a theologian, and ceases to be a mere student of nature. Every man, however, has his choice whether he shall merely collect facts, or if he shall also reason from his facts.

It might be objected to the Archbishop of York's lecture that the lecturer is blaming the scientific men of the present day for not combining theology with natural science. He seems to be asking them to enter on a province which they wish to avoid, until at least they have proceeded further in their inquiries. He is blaming Bacon, Spinoza, Bishop Sprat, and many devout Theists and Christians, for pursuing natural studies in the spirit of pure science. If we want a verdict from scientific men, it is surely not desirable that they should give it until they are prepared to give it. It is absolutely necessary that the freedom of science be absolute. It must be independent of theology. It must never be afraid of its own legitimate conclusions. It is not desirable that any truth in nature should be missed through fear of its being

in conflict with anything in Christianity, much less with any belief which is merely an inference, and may be after all no part of Christianity. Galileo must not be made to say that the earth stands still if he is certain that it moves.

Against the Archbishop's main argument scientific men can have but little to say. He seems to be giving that verdict on religion from science which at present they decline to give. If indeed any of them say that matter is eternal, they are, as the Archbishop shows, deserting their own province. But we have no right to make inferences for them. It is one thing to deny creation: it is quite another thing to modify or change the popular view of creation. Supposing the hypothesis of development to be established, that would not exclude the operation of Deity in nature. Development is not the antithesis of creation. The growth of a human body is as much the work of God as the immediate creation of a full-grown man. Science and religion alike forbid us to conclude that if God works by the process of development there is therefore no creation and no God. Mr. Wallace, the most eminent advocate of development after Mr. Darwin, has distinctly declared that 'it is simply a question of how the Creator has worked.' To this the Duke of Argyll entirely subscribes, denying that he ever advocated 'incessant interference,' or 'continual rearrangement of details.'* If Moleschott, speaking scientifically, has said 'no phosphorus, no thinking,' is it anything more than was said by Locke concerning thought and the material brain? and is not Locke's answer satis-

* See Appendix to fifth edition of 'The Reign of Law.'

factory, that God may have connected the faculty of thinking with matter? The Archbishop himself answers to the same effect, and his answer is sufficient to remove all suspicion that there is any necessary atheism in modern science.

Two more of the lectures in this series deal partly with science. Mr. Jackson inflicts severe wounds on the Positivists. He knows and understands his adversary. It may be unscientific, using the word in reference to physical studies, to mix up theology with the study of nature; but it is unphilosophical, in the widest and truest sense of philosophy, to limit the intellect of men to the study merely of what is cognisable by the outward sense. Comte and Comtism have been immensely overrated. Positivism is a heresy of this generation, and can scarcely be expected to outlive it. The few grains of truth which it contains are valuable. Wise men will appropriate them and pass on.

The Dean of Canterbury gives a cautious lecture in the style of Bishop Butler. He does not attempt to prove much, but tries to obviate some difficulties. He balances the arguments for revelation with those against it, and he shows not only its probability but its necessity as part of the system of this world—that is, supposing the world to be the work of a creator. There is, of course, the alternative that after all the world may be a bungle, our hopes but dreams, and our beliefs the wild nettles of a luxuriant imagination. But to the Theist this is all improbable. There is nothing, the Dean says, in nature—even according to Mr. Darwin's interpretation of nature—which has not

its use, and for the neglect of which nature does not inflict a penalty. We have religious faculties, and for the exercise of them we expect a field. Natural religion is insufficient, and therefore we conclude the possibility or probability of revealed. The Dean does not go further. The only exception which can be taken to his argument is, that revelation may be something very different from what he understands it to be. It may come by an infallible Church, or by an infallible Bible, but it may also be an internal illumination never expressed in human words, and perhaps incapable of any outward expression.

The subject of Dr. Rigg's lecture is 'Pantheism.' From its contents, however, it should be classed with those that refer to the study of natural science. The Archbishop of York began his lecture by quoting—apparently, with approbation—the old devout Pantheistic utterance, 'All things are full of God.' Dr. Rigg, as a Wesleyan minister, must sometimes sing one of John Wesley's hymns where this verse is found:—

'In Thee we move. *All things of Thee*
Are full. Thou Source and Life of all!
 Thou vast unfathomable sea!
 Fall prostrate, lost in wonder fall,
 Ye sons of men.'

This Deity of which all things are full, was the Deity of the old Greek philosophers, of the Neo-Platonists, and of how many other philosophers we cannot at present inquire.

A lecturer on Pantheism might really have said something important. The word itself is very indefinite, and Dr. Rigg rightly begins with a definition.

But his definition only defines atheism, which he refutes under the assumption that the teachers of development and natural selection are atheists. This is a great mistake, but so common with men who ought to know better that we excuse Dr. Rigg. We cannot, however, excuse him for evading the subject on which he undertook to lecture. There are three well-known books on Pantheism—‘*Am Pantheismus,*’ by G. B. Jäsche; ‘*Essai sur le Panthéisme,*’ by the Abbé Maret; and an ‘*Essay on Pantheism,*’ by the present writer. They are all written from different stand-points; but all agree as to what is commonly called Pantheism. M. Maret includes among Pantheists all who think of Deity otherwise than the Church has decreed—that is, not merely the old Pagan philosophers, but Catholics like Malebranche, and all Protestants whatever, especially M. Guizot.

‘Pantheism,’ says Dr. Rigg, ‘agrees with atheism in its denial of a personal Deity. Its divinity of the universe is a divinity without a will and without conscious intelligence.’ If so it is no divinity at all, and Pantheism really is atheism. But under this definition of Pantheism are we to include Greek philosophers, and Neo-Platonists, Christian Fathers like Synesius, schoolmen like Erigena, mystics like Eckhart, philosophers like Spinoza, and the Transcendentalists? These and such as these, including, confessedly, Goethe and our own Carlyle, are the men commonly called Pantheists. Is their Deity ‘without a will and without conscious intelligence?’ Manifestly they have either been misnamed Pantheists, or Pantheism is not atheism. The one word which has

to be said on this subject is to explain in what sense God is either personal or impersonal. We are at the mercy of words. Most men use them as if they were mere inventions for concealing what we wish to say. A 'person' in ordinary speech is an individual. It implies the conjunction of a rational mind with a bodily form. We do not call a brute a person, for a person is higher than a brute. We do not call a mind a person, for a body is necessary to the very idea of person. Some of the Fathers held that God was a body. They felt it difficult to conceive of God otherwise than under the form of a man. Corporeity was to them personality. Socrates, the historian, says that the monks of Egypt made a riot in Alexandria because Theophilus denied that God was corporeal. This was to them a denial of personality. They were right. Personality must go with corporeity. Schleiermacher wisely dismissed personal from the attributes of Deity. The question, he said, between us and the Materialists is, not whether there be a personal, but whether there be a living God. The converse of personal is impersonal. In the sense of incorporeal God is impersonal. He transcends the limits of finite personality. He is an infinite mind. If words could always be understood, it would be the profoundest reverence to deny a personal God.

In logical order Dr. Stoughton's lecture might be said to follow the Dean of Canterbury's. It is the first approach to the subject of evidences proper. Christianity was established by miracles. There is a multitude of ideas connected with miracles, which it is necessary to keep very clearly and very distinctly

apart from each other. We seem at last to have come to a tolerably unanimous agreement as to what a miracle means. It is something out of the *observed* course of nature—‘a wonder’ or ‘sign,’ but not, therefore, out of *the* order of nature. Miracles, Dr. Stoughton says, ‘are not spoken of as “violations” of law, or as “suspensions” of law, or as “contradictions” of law.’ They are not, then, impossible, as Spinoza and Baden Powell are supposed to have taught. A word by the way for Spinoza. Mr. Farrar has settled him in a note by a quotation from Mr. Mozley. The quotation is: ‘The existence of God assumed, the law of the Divine nature is as much a law of nature as the law which it suspends.’ Mr. Farrar’s comment is: ‘This is a complete answer to the objection of Spinoza.’ The answer was not only suggested by Bishop Butler, but it is really Spinoza’s own explanation of miracles. He does not deny the miracles of the Bible. He only maintains that they were within the predetermined order of nature. They were always wrought by natural means. The locusts were brought by an east wind. The Red Sea was dried up by a west wind. There is always, he says, something more in a miracle than the absolute command of God. There is always the use of a natural cause. He admits that in the Bible miracles the cause is not always given, because they are, as he says, ‘expressed in such words and phrases as are most likely to stir men up to devotion.’ These words are almost repeated by Dr. Stoughton, who evidently did not know that he was only following ‘the holy but repudiated Spinoza.’ The scheme of Bible interpreta-

tion which Spinoza advocated was, that we should regard Biblical language and ideas as corresponding to the capacities of the people at the time when the different books were written. Many things supposed to be miracles were not really miracles; yet Spinoza admits that God, for the purposes of revelation, worked miraculously—that is, in the way of wonders or signs. For instance, God spoke to Moses in a real voice when He delivered the ten commandments. To suppose the contrary, Spinoza says, is to wrest the Scriptures. He cannot, of course, believe that God ‘has the shape of a man, and speaks with a human voice.’ But the Israelites did hear a voice, which may have been created for the purpose of uttering the law on that occasion. When he can find the natural cause he gives it; but, unlike Eichorn and Paulus, he does not propose an explanation of all Bible miracles. A physical explanation would be interesting to the student of natural science. But the religious element in a miracle is higher and more significant than the physical. Dr. Stoughton intimates, in accordance with popular belief, that Spinoza denies the transcendence of Deity. It is the peculiar characteristic of Spinoza’s system that it maintains pre-eminently the immanence of God in nature. Spinoza does not speak of God transcending nature; but, by another distinction, he teaches all that this transcendence can mean. ‘*Natura naturans*’ is the conscious, intelligent, creative Deity, and ‘*natura naturata*’ is that which is formed. It is, of course, easy to put a heterodox meaning on the system of any original thinker, but Christian prudence, as

well as Christian charity, require us to give his words the best interpretation which they can fairly claim.

But this very uncertainty of the physical significance of a miracle affects the value of miracles considered as evidence. Inquiring men, who had learned to see God in the observed order of nature, were slow in admitting the miraculous. False miracles were common, and discrimination was required to distinguish the true from the false. To those who believe that miracles have now ceased, there is considerable difficulty in believing that there ever were any miracles. Roman Catholics believed that miracles still continue. Our old apologists, such as Bishop Parker and Daniel Whitby, believed that for centuries after Christ miracles were wrought in the Christian Church. Richard Baxter found the manna in the wilderness credible, for when he was minister of Bridgenorth there was a shower of manna on the church and the parsonage. Even the Thames had not then got into regular habits, for on November 2, 1660, it had three tides in twelve hours. Such miracles do not occur in our day. We therefore doubt if those recorded by Baxter were genuine, and we have at least a difficulty in believing the miracles in the Bible simply as miracles.

With the apologists of Baxter's time—as, for instance, Archbishops Tillotson and Sharp—the great miracle question was to show how the miracles wrought in old times were evidences to us. We did not see them, and we only have testimony that they were really miracles. The apologists showed that the testimony was good; that is, quite as good as we

have for any other matters of history; and this, they said, was enough. Sharp even turned the argument, from the want of miracles now, to the confirmation of those recorded in the Bible. It was, he said, the order of Providence to work by settled and natural causes, the Deity only interfering when a necessity emerged. This was said in a sermon on the words, 'If they believe not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded if one rose from the dead'—a text which evidently does not give even to immediate miracles the highest place as evidence. Hume's argument, that it is more likely the testimony should be false than the miracles true, had a deep meaning. It was, however, sufficiently answered by the consideration that there were circumstances which made miracles probable. But we cannot in any case get beyond the position that miracles are credible. We receive Christianity, and therefore we receive the miracles; but they really are in the way of faith, and cannot, by any possible alchemy, be made evidences of the truth of Christianity to the men of this generation. Mr. Farrar's reasoning is excellent, and so are some of Dr. Stoughton's arguments; but they never reach beyond the mere credibility of the miraculous. The miracles of the Bible are probably true, but they cannot themselves be converted into proofs.

The lectures of Professor Rawlinson, Professor Leathes, and Mr. Row, introduce us to some of the very ingenious schemes for attacking Christianity, and some of the complicated defences of its advocates. The perverse ingenuity of Strauss, and the brilliant

but fallacious, and often inconsistent theories of M. Renan, have occasioned a great deal of writing in defence of Christianity, the sum of which for the most part is but sound and fury, and its significance nothing. It is easy to make counter theories quite as good as those of Strauss or Renan; but this is only fighting without the citadel, and withdrawing the attention from the central question. If unbelievers are really anxious for truth, they cannot take a more ready way of defeating themselves than by extravagant theories which make the most of every apparent mistake or contradiction in the Gospel histories. Every violent stroke is likely to recoil, to give an apparent triumph to the other party, and be a hindrance to calm investigation. Mr. Farrar gives evidence of this in his vindication of St. Luke's Gospel. It ought to have been enough for every sincere mind to have supposed that Luke could not have greatly erred in simple matters of history that belonged to his own time. But because his statements could not be reconciled with all that we could learn from profane history, he has been denounced as a careless compiler. Mr. Farrar says, 'Sergius, the pro-consul of Cyprus, was believed to have been a proprætor till St. Luke's authority was finally confirmed by the evidence of coins. Lysanias, tetrarch of Abilene, was ridiculed as a clumsy invention, till even Renan has the candour to admit that his recent examination of the inscription of Zenodorus at Baalbeck has led him to believe that the evangelist was not so gravely wrong. The taxing in the time of Cyrenius had long been branded as a flagrant and damaging anachronism till the industry of Zumpt

demonstrated that it was an historical datum implied, though not recorded by other historians.' This is a triumphant answer to all objections, but St. Luke may be an accurate historian without Christianity being true. Mr. Rowe is successful in refuting 'Mythical Theories of Christianity.' 'If,' he says, 'the Gospels are not in their main outlines historically true, they are no more divine than Shakespeare.' But they may be in the main historically true and yet not a revelation in the sense which Mr. Rowe intends. To refute opponents is often but a small step towards establishing our own position.

Professor Rawlinson removes some other historical difficulties, but makes the Bible subject to the same accidents as have befallen other books. The Old Testament, he admits, is incorrect in its figures, and the original, in some records at least, probably lost. Professor Leathes is more ambitious. He gives 'a mythical theory' on the believers' side. If Christianity depended on the mere ingenuity either of its assailants or its defenders, we should say the combatants were about equal. The Professor manages a very small argument with very great skill. To Christians, that is, to those who already believe, it is interesting to find confirmations of belief in casual expressions which have hitherto been overlooked. But unbelievers are not generally convinced by minute reasoning. St. Paul mentions in an epistle to the Corinthians that five hundred persons had seen Jesus after his resurrection. Of these many had fallen asleep, yet the Professor supposes that at least two hundred and fifty of them were still alive. St. Paul

had lived among the Corinthian Christians, and doubtless had often spoken of the five hundred who had seen the Lord. The belief of Christ's resurrection was general; the churches were founded on it. The early history of Christianity is inexplicable without this belief. St. Paul's epistles everywhere assure us that it was universally received. Now if Christ did not rise we have effects for which we can assign no adequate cause.

This argument is excellent, but we can easily imagine a really sincere unbeliever being simply provoked by it. His trouble is that there have been great delusions in the world; that very great facts have been founded on very great fictions. A man indeed who does not believe that there is truth in Christianity must be haunted with the belief that the world is governed by imposture and superstition. This is his perplexity. Christianity too may be founded on a deception. This is a part of the phenomena which he has to investigate. His first question to Mr. Leathes would be concerning the manner in which the five hundred saw Jesus after He was risen. They saw Him at once, and they only saw Him once. Were they at worship and under the influence of excited feelings? Had some powerful preacher, some Whitefield or Simeon of the early Church, held them entranced by a description of the glories of the risen Saviour? Did they see Jesus as Paul saw Him, whether in the body or out of the body they could not tell? It is strange that He should only have appeared once to a congregation of five hundred, and strange that that appearing

should only be once mentioned. David Strauss can erect an ingenious argument on a very small foundation, but he certainly has a rival in Professor Leathes.

We can imagine the unbeliever, in no spirit of wantonness, but in solemn sadness, setting aside the inference from the unbelief of the Corinthians concerning the future resurrection which the Professor says cannot be set aside. It really argues no sceptical spirit on the part of the Corinthians. They had simply misunderstood what the Apostle had told them about the resurrection, supposing perhaps that it was 'past already.' We misapprehend the character of the first Christians if we suppose that they refused to believe until they were convinced by arguments. They were taken captive by the living spirit of the Gospel. They felt the new life and lived it. Modern evidences would only have made them sceptics. The first disciples of Jesus were the poor and the illiterate. The scribes did not believe on Him. When His Apostles went out into the world they subdued the hearts of men. Philosophers like Tacitus could only see in Christianity one of the '*atrocia aut pudenda*' which from all quarters flowed into the great city, and shrewd reasoners like Pliny found it nothing else but '*superstitionem pravam et immodicam.*'

The Bishop of Ely has made the influence of Christ's character—or, what is the same thing, the inherent moral power of the Gospel—the subject of his lecture. This is an argument to which no ingenuous sceptic can take any exception. Many, indeed, whom the lecturers in this series regard as unbelievers, go entirely with the bishop in acknow-

ledging the supreme and, in some respects, unique character of Gospel morality and Gospel holiness. They will, however, object to the argument which the bishop builds on it for his view of revelation. They will object also to some of the details. They will admit that Jesus was a higher development of humanity than other men, and they will admit also that Gospel morality is clearer and more definite than Pagan morality. They will, however, deny the interval which the bishop tries to make and on which his main argument rests. No such break between Christian morality and that of Pagan philosophy was ever made by the Christian writers of the first centuries. Arnobius goes so far as to say that if the works of Cicero were read the Christians need not trouble themselves about Scriptures. Augustine finds in Plato, in Seneca, in Virgil, and other philosophers, the principles of the city of God. He even ascribes the beginning of his conversion to reading Cicero's 'Hortensius.' The bishop marks specially in the morality of Jesus, that He laid great stress on purity of thought. But to the familiar verse beginning, 'If any man look on a woman,' we can quote a parallel found even among the impurities of Ovid—

'Si qua metu dempto casta est, ea denique casta est,
Quae, quia non liceat, non facit; illa facit.*'

The golden rule was uttered by Severus, 'Quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne feceris.' Forgiveness is taught by Plato, who introduces Socrates saying, 'An injury by no means is to be done, nor may it be repaid to him that hath done an injury.' And love to our

* *Amorum*, lib. iii. el. iv.

enemies does not seem to have been unknown. Origen says that a man once destroyed one of Lycurgus's eyes, but Lycurgus instead of punishing him never ceased to give him good advice, till 'he also became a philosopher.' Origen also records that one of Zeno's enemies once said to him, 'Let me perish if I do thee not a mischief;' and Zeno answered, 'Let me perish if I do not reconcile thee to me.'

The bishop's argument for the isolation of Christ from other great teachers raises the question of the genuineness of the fourth Gospel; but even when that is admitted, the question of the sense in which Jesus was divine, is still undecided. Was it the Neo-Platonic sense in which the Logos or wisdom of God was believed to dwell in all good men, and in virtue of which philosophers like Porphyry and Plotinus had occasional foretastes by divine absorption of their eternal union with the Deity? The statement which the bishop makes that all the apostolic Fathers are clear on the Godhead of Christ is denied in the bishop's sense by Sandius, Episcopius, and Curcellæus, among Protestants; and by the learned Petavius among Catholics. It is easy to say that Bishop Bull refuted them, but it is equally easy to say that he did not. The mere fact that the early Church was uncertain in what sense Christ was God, or, to put it in another form, that there is any uncertainty as to what the early Church taught on this subject, takes away the foundation for any argument that can have weight with an unbeliever. The distinction which the bishop makes between the divinity which Christ claims and that of all Pagan incarnations is ingenious,

but it is also open to controversy. It is true, as he says, that the Gospel gives a deep sense of the greatness of sin and of the love of God in forgiving it, but Lord Herbert has shown that these things were deeply felt by many in the Gentile world. It is quite possible for God to give men a sense of sin and of forgiveness without any external revelation such as we have in Christianity. To suppose this, would be to remove the objection from the want of universality in the outward revelation, which the Bishop of Ely feels to be a great mystery. It was no perplexity to Lord Herbert. He had an answer from the universality of the revelation within.*

Without in any way disparaging the intrinsic value of any of these lectures, we give our decided preference to that by the Bishop of Carlisle. It is the most suggestive, and nearest the tract in which we think will ultimately be found the final solution of the difficulties which are in the way of an intellectual apprehension of the significance of the Christian revelation. The really essential question to be settled is what revelation means—what it is in its contents, and in what way it has been given. On this question and those connected with it, there are great diversities of judgment among Christians. Arguments for revela-

* We have some scruples about calling Lord Herbert a Deist. His chief object was to show the certainty of natural religion, which is immediate, over merely traditional revelation, the truth of which however he nowhere denies. The bishop has made a curious slip in calling him 'the most eminent of the Deists of the last century.' Lord Herbert, when a young man, was presented at the court of Queen Elizabeth.

The bishop also quotes as from Horace the well-known lines of Ovid :

'Probo meliora sequor deteriora.' †

Why does not the bishop get his examining chaplain to read his proof-sheets?—X.

† Video meliora, proboque; Deteriora sequor.

tion are wasted until it is determined what revelation is. The Bishop of Carlisle tries to settle this question, and specially so far as the mode is concerned. To reveal is explained as to unveil. The unveiling was gradual. The revelation was developed, that is to say, it was made 'at sundry times and in divers manners.' But the last development was contained in the original idea, as a bird existed in the egg or a plant in the seed. The process is under the Divine superintendence. God is 'the developer, and His eternal purpose the thing developed.' It is desirable in our terrible fight with the imperfections and ambiguities of words to define at every step. With this definition of development on the authority of a bishop, let us not forget that it need not imply any godless or undivine process. It is, however, on the word 'gradual' that the bishop wishes to lay most stress. Here we have an analogy between God's works in nature and His mode of revealing Himself to man. Four stages are distinctly marked. The first is the revelation to Adam and Eve, the second to Abraham, the third to Moses, and the last in and by Jesus Christ. Revelation at these stages was adapted to the capacities of men at the different periods when it was made. In the fulness of time the revelation was completed. This is said to correspond to the gradual work of nature and the gradual process of creation as described in the beginning of Genesis. Bishop Butler has shown from the analogy of religion to the constitution and course of nature that difficulties in revelation are not greater than difficulties in nature, and the Bishop of Carlisle adds, 'Certainly

those who are prepared to receive the Darwinian view of the development of man's body, ought not to find anything to offend them on the ground of improbability in the Scriptural account of the revelation made by God to the human soul.'

In estimating anything which Bishop Butler said, it is always necessary to bear in mind the precise connection in which it is said. No man that ever reasoned so thoroughly proved what he undertook to prove, but no writer on evidences ever undertook to prove so little. That we are to expect difficulties in revelation because there are difficulties in nature, is not to be received absolutely. We expect that revelation will remove difficulties in nature. Butler was arguing with Deists who believed in a wise and benevolent Deity. To them the argument had a force which it could not have to mere sceptics or inquirers. The difficulty in the way of believing Christianity is only increased by the additional difficulty in nature in the way of faith in the Deity.

The objection, however, that revelation should make natural difficulties plain, is made on the assumption that revelation is the immediate opposite of nature. Without ascribing to Butler more than he meant, he may be said to have given the first hint of learning the mode of revelation from the Divine working in nature. The Bishop of Carlisle has made a beginning with the application of this hint. Some ingenious theologian, some future Origen or Malebranche, may be able to complete the parallel between development in revelation and Mr. Darwin's development in nature. This will considerably modify our present views of

Christianity, and enable us to embrace within the Christian fold many of the 'educated classes,' who are now supposed to be without the 'city of God.' Revelation will then be independent of the absolute truth of the Bible records. The Bible will maintain a place suitable to the nature of its contents and the manner of its composition. It will be regarded as the outward human expression of the divine impulse within, —the history of the highest religious experiences of the race. Instead of supposing that God adapted His revelation to the capacities of men, we shall then regard the different stages of development at different eras as marking the capacities of the race for understanding the revelation made within.

The Bishop of Carlisle suggests a starting point which might serve for this theory. It is not necessary to set aside the story of Adam and Eve. It may be literally true, or it may not. But we have what the bishop calls its 'philosophical meaning.' It represents the dawn of man's religious consciousness. It is the era in his history when he awoke to a sense of responsibility, of a moral law and of sin. All this might have happened by an internal unfolding, development, or revelation. There may have been an external voice; but this supposition is not indispensable. The revelation essentially was the fact that man became conscious of responsibility. In a conventional sense we have come to limit the use of the word revelation to the contents of the Scriptures. We speak of revealed religion as opposed to natural. We suppose our faculties to be inadequate for the discovery of truth, and so we posit revelation as the com-

plement of natural religion. But this distinction is of our own making. It supposes that truth which we reach by reason to be a discovery of our own, and not a discovery which God has made to us. It supposes, in fact, that our faculties were not given by God. 'Ungrateful man,' cried Malebranche, 'to call that knowledge natural which God has revealed.' The conclusions to which we come by reason St. Paul calls revelation. Speaking of the knowledge of God which the Pagans had, he says, 'God hath *manifested* it to them.' A legitimate distinction might, however, be made between reason and revelation corresponding to the distinction between reasoning and intuition, or knowledge mediate and immediate. The definition which limits revelation to the contents of the Bible is altogether modern. Bishop Williams, in his 'Boyle Lectures,' distinguishes between natural and supernatural revelation. Adam before his fall had natural revelation. Supernatural was added because of the necessity of restoration. But now that all miracles are regarded as within the order of nature, what was reckoned supernatural may be embraced in the natural. The future theologian, whom we are supposing to be setting forth this theory of revelation, will have to apply it to the different cases in the Scriptures. He will have least difficulty with the prophets, or those who simply professed to have been inspired. The words 'the Lord said,' and 'the word of the Lord came unto me saying,' may have meant an internal voice. But there will be no necessity to deny the literal truth of the external voices of which we read in the Scriptures. They may have been true; but

the necessity of taking them literally is not indispensable. An internal voice may have called Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldees. The 'fierce ritual of Syria' may have told him to sacrifice his son, and yet this may still in a sense be a voice from God; but a voice speaking through the imperfections of man.

This view of revelation will supersede the necessity of explaining every occurrence in Bible history. To piety God will still speak to Moses in the burning bush, and go before the camp of Israel 'an awful guide in smoke and flame.' The truth of these appearances will not be denied; but the mode of them may be questions for the free exercise either of reason or speculation. The details of Jewish worship may come from God, but not immediately. They will not be regarded as God adapting Himself to the capacity of the Jews; but as the expression of the stage of religious development which the Jews had then reached. They may show the wisdom of Moses in devising worship suitable to a people who had been used to the idolatrous ritual of Egypt. The antagonism of the spirit of the prophets to that of the priests will then be easily explained. The higher spirit of the prophets had virtually set aside the law. The ideal of the ceremonies, the ideal of the priesthood, was 'a stand-point overcome.' The revelation appears not in the details, but in the result—in the progress which the nation made in real goodness. The spirit of the prophets was perfected in Christ. No external voice speaks to Him. He reveals Himself, and that is revealing the Father. In Him the tide of divine life overflows into the world. His own

growth in wisdom, like His growth in stature, was subject to the laws of gradual development. Miracles are not necessary to make us believe in Him. We can dispense with all theories of the incarnation, Arian, Nicene, or ante-Nicene. It is not necessary to suppose that He was God in any other way than as all good men will ultimately be God. The eternal Logos that was in Him was enough to make Him divine. His birth may have been miraculous. He may have risen from the dead and ascended into Heaven. These things are probable; so probable that we believe them. But they come to us only on testimony. They are, after all, but probabilities; that of which we are certain is the revelation that was in Jesus, and through Him is made to the world. His words and the lessons of His life are the inheritance of the race for all time.

‘God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake unto the fathers, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son.’ This is the text on which the Bishop of Carlisle builds his doctrine of the development of revelation. It would not be right to ascribe to the author of this text the complete idea of a scheme of revelation such as we have supposed. He might, indeed, have included both the internal and the external revelations; but evidently the latter were to him the more prominent. He did not extend revelation to the race. He did not make the great idea of revelation the unfolding of God in the human mind. His stand-point as a Christian Jew led him to speak only of the revelations in the Jewish books. He supposed ‘occasional interpositions’ from without,

such as Mr. Darwin entirely excludes from the development of nature. He says nothing, indeed, of future revelations; but if we are to complete the analogy between nature and revelation we must suppose that revelation has never ceased; that God works unceasingly in the human mind as He works in nature. We know not what will be the end of progress, or what the next great unfolding in the natural world. Future generations may surpass us as much as we surpass the quadrumana, and a light may dawn on our minds as much beyond Christianity, as we now understand it, as the mind of Jesus was beyond that of the distant man who first awoke to a consciousness of responsibility.

The great objection to this view of revelation will be the same as that made to Mr. Darwin's theory of development. It gives no certainty that God is the worker. It leaves the possibility that, after all, our beliefs may be but the creations of fancy, and our hopes never realised. It does not satisfy us to know that all nations have believed in God and a life to come, and that this belief is rational, and agreeable to the moral constitution of man. We want a certainty without to confirm the consciousness within. This was the objection which Richard Baxter made to the scheme of Lord Herbert. He felt within himself an 'unsatisfactory kind of apprehension till he looked to *supernatural* evidence.' He confessed, indeed, that this was but the weakness of 'a soul in flesh.' Yet it was a feeling natural to us as we are now constituted. It was the same thing which the sceptic Simmias expressed in the 'Phædo,' when he longed for the

assurance of what Socrates taught by 'a word from God.'

It is possible that this craving for an external certainty may have created the object which it craves. The philosophical student of Roman Catholicism must have seen how marvellous are the devices in the Church of Rome to meet every craving of the human mind. To the same craving is due the dogma of Scripture infallibility which long reigned among Protestants. Revelation has not been given us in the way that we could have wished it to have been given. It is not written in the heavens. It is not preached by angels. No immortals appear to men. The preachers of Christianity preach only what they themselves believe, and they speak to the world with a divergence of beliefs enough to distract the illiterate and to make the educated sceptics. Evidence-writers fill volumes with learned arguments which are beyond the reach of the multitude, and which only provoke controversy among those who have time to read them. When they offer 'the word from God' which Simmias craved, they only give a tradition that there was 'a word from God' in past times. The 'open vision' which we crave is still wanting. The absolute certainty never comes. But few of us ever act as if we really believed that we had an absolute certainty for what Christianity teaches. How few even of the most pious Christians regard the other life as a compensation for the loss of this! In words we do so every day. We give God 'hearty thanks' for taking 'a brother' out of the miseries of this sinful world, and yet we mourn the loss of friends as the greatest of cala-

mities, not for our sakes, but for theirs. This divergence between our words and our thoughts is itself an evidence that we come short of absolute certainty. We have a devout hope, and this helps us to resignation; but only in cases of extreme suffering or ecstatic piety do we ever really feel that 'to die is gain.'

Protestant theologians have not yet understood how much was implied in giving up an infallible Church. While that remained there was ample ground for supposing the external certainty of revelation. The infallible Church existed always, a living incarnation of the 'word from God.' It was in itself a continuous external revelation satisfying every desire of man, provided he could take the Church on its own authority, without looking at its credentials. But with the rejection of the infallibility of the Church, men were thrown for certainty entirely on the internal word. The history of this is forgotten in our literature. It was ignored long before it was forgotten; but we can distinctly trace it in the great controversies of our Church and nation. In Archbishop Laud's conference with Fisher the Jesuit, the Archbishop was asked how, without the infallible voice of the Church, he knew the Scriptures to be the Word of God? He objected that this was not a question which ought to be raised among Christians. The Jesuit was not willing that the sole point at issue should be ignored. His triumph was to press the Archbishop either to admit the infallibility of the Church, or uncertainty as to any external revelation. The Archbishop gave the usual Protestant answers—1, we have the testimony,

of the Church ; 2, the Scripture shines by its own light ; 3, the testimony of the Spirit to the Christian mind ; and 4, the evidence of reason. He admitted that none of these was sufficient in itself, yet if taken together, the four links, insufficient in themselves, would make a strong chain. About the time of the Restoration, another Roman Catholic wrote an answer to Laud's argument, called 'Labyrinthus Cantuariensis,' or Dr. Laud's Labyrinth, in which he pressed the Protestants of that day to answer Fisher's question to Laud—How we know the Scriptures to be the Word of God? This book was reckoned so formidable an assault on Protestantism, that Humphrey Henchman, Bishop of London, asked Stillingfleet, then Dean of St. Paul's, to answer it. The outcome of Stillingfleet's answer was that our certainty of the truth of Christianity is only 'moral,' and not absolute. When we weigh the arguments, there is a balance of 'probabilities' in its favour, but the assurance we have is that of the Spirit testifying within. Hooker had come to the same conclusion. He was charged by Travers with making the Word of God less certain than things of which the evidence comes by outward sense. The charge is substantially admitted. For sensible things, Hooker said, we have the certainty of evidence, but for the Word of God 'the certainty of adherence.' Chillingworth gave the same answer to Knott. He resolved evidence mainly into the inward testimony of the Spirit, which gave 'obsignation and confirmation' to Christian minds. Locke, in the same way, made the certainty of revelation to depend on the internal evidence of the Spirit.

He makes up by 'the assurance of faith' for what is wanting in absolute certainty.

The next stage in this history was the rise of the Deists, who resolved all religion into that which we derive from our faculties. If there was no absolute certainty that the Scriptures were the Word of God, they could not have that place as an infallible authority to override conscience and reason which had been given to them by Protestants. The Deists denied, or at least doubted, the external word. The internal was of more importance. To this conclusion the way had been led by Hooker and Chillingworth, Stillingfleet and Locke. An opportunity had come for a fair and equitable settlement of the meaning of revelation. But the evidence-writers arose with their manifold proofs of the absolute certainty of that which theologians had just relegated to moral certainty. The Deists urged their difficulties, and the Apologists vehemently 'proved' Christianity. But religion was independent of them both, and as if to rebuke them both, it came back without arguments, and its power was felt as that of a wind that 'bloweth where it listeth.'

We have not hitherto noticed Canon Cook's lecture on 'The Completeness and Adequacy of the Evidences of Christianity.' There is a double meaning in this title which is not removed, but rather confirmed, by the contents of the lecture. It covers both the literature of evidences and the evidences themselves. In the first sense the evidences are, as the lecturer says, 'of vast extent;' but he surely over-estimates their value if he supposes them either complete or adequate.

The writings of the early apologists of Christianity did great service in helping to destroy the old fabric of Paganism, but their arguments for Christianity would create amusement if repeated before any intelligent assembly of Christians in the present day. The great burden of them all is not the miracles or the character of Christ, but the miracles which continued to be performed in the Church. Irenæus says that they could still cure the lame or the paralytic with a touch. Arnobius and Origen challenge the Pagans to cast out devils either from beasts or men as was done daily by 'the most simple and rustic Christians.' Even in Augustine's great work, 'De Civitate Dei,' the main arguments are a multitude of incredible miracles. The most sensible of them is one concerning a poor cobbler who was in want of a coat, and coming to the shrine of the twenty martyrs, he prayed that they would provide him with raiment. The boys followed him through the streets shouting, 'Cobbler Flo, Cobbler Flo, have you been praying to the martyrs for a few halfpence to buy a coat?' But as he walked along the sea-shore, near the harbour of Hippo, he saw a large fish cast on the sands. He sold it to a Christian cook for three hundred pence. With this he bought wool, out of which his wife was able to spin as much cloth as made him a garment. Moreover, the cook found a gold ring in the fish's stomach, and being a Christian, he gave it to the cobbler saying, 'How wonderfully the martyrs have provided you with garments!' As for the works of modern apologists, we cannot estimate them at the same value as Canon Cook does. Grotius can now be regarded

only as a curiosity in Latin. The arguments of our own old English evidence-writers are as amusing as those of the early Fathers. Richard Baxter proves the Bible to be the Word of God because it is too good to be the word of the devil. Bishop Parker demonstrated the truth of Christianity from the story of 'The Thundering Legion,' from 'The Acts of Pilate,' and the 'brief and pithy answer of Jesus' to the letter of Agbarus, King of Edessa. Dr. Whitby established the truth of Christianity from miracles being wrought by Gnostics, Carpocratians, and Saturnalians; by Finland witches, Chaldean Magi, and Egyptian sorcerers, and by the miracles of the early Church as attested by the Fathers. Joseph Glanvil refuted atheists and unbelievers by stories of 'the demon of Tedworth' and 'the witch of Shepton Mallet.' Charles Leslie proved Christianity by the same 'hard Church' argument which establishes the divine right of Episcopacy, or any other divine right that a wild imagination may devise. The apologists of the eighteenth century Canon Cook classes among 'the foremost champions of the cross.' We cannot accord to them this honour. Even supposing they were successful against the Deists, it cannot be said that religion owed much to them. Mr. Pattison says they proved Christianity, but what to do with it after it was proved they did not very well know. Earnest religion was to them mere fanaticism and madness. Warburton's estimate of Wesley's revival is a true index of the spirit of the apologetical writers of the eighteenth century. Even the best of them had no religious influence. Butler was only intelligible to

select audiences, and Paley preached to empty pews.*

We do not think that Canon Cook is more successful in maintaining the completeness and adequacy of the evidences themselves. He says a few words of miracles, which we have already shown are defences that need to be defended, and proofs that require to be proved. We that already believe Christianity, take the miracles with it, but to urge them as arguments to an inquirer is to make a use of them which they will not bear. The lecturer also says a few words on prophecy, but here again we have nothing to present that will have any effect on the mind of a doubter. It is not true that Jesus was expected. The Jews expected a triumphant Messiah, but not such a teacher as Jesus was. It would be difficult, as Dr. Rowland Williams showed, to find a single prophecy in the Old Testament directly applicable to the Messiah. Anthony Collins settled this a hundred and fifty years ago in a way that has never been answered. Every one of the Messianic prophecies quoted in the New Testament is an application or accommodation of Old Testament words, often in a sense altogether new. We that are already Christians can justify the accommodations. They were to some extent arguments to the Jews; but to urge them on a modern inquirer

* There is a story told in Sunderland, that when Paley was Rector of Bishopwearmouth, he was once visited by his patron, Bishop Barrington. The Bishop and the Rector walked down the High Street together till they came to the end of Sans Street, where a huge four-walled brick building had just been erected. When the Bishop saw it he exclaimed, 'I say, Paley, what building is this?' 'Why, my Lord,' Paley answered, 'it's a Methodist chapel.' 'Methodist chapel!' said the Bishop. 'Does anybody go to it?' 'I hope they do, my lord,' said Paley, 'for very few people go to Church.'

would only be to perplex him. We agree more with the lecturer when he directs doubters to the contemplation of the personal character of Jesus, and the necessity of feeling truth previously to reasoning about it. Christianity has won its triumphs as a life, not as a creed. The life has co-existed with a thousand creeds diverse in kind, and often antagonistic to each other. Those whom the lecturer wishes to convince will be repelled by the alternative that they must give up the moral excellence of Jesus, or accept Him as God. We dislike this kind of reasoning. We dislike these dilemmas, which break the bruised reed, or quench the smoking flax. Christ may have been God and yet not in the sense which Canon Cook understands the divinity of Christ. It is said in the Gospels that Jesus grew in wisdom. He says Himself that of the day and the hour of the final judgment He knew nothing. He predicted many things which were to happen before the generation to which He belonged had passed away; and, so far as we know, these things have not happened yet. It is possible to explain all these passages. We that believe do explain them, but they are difficulties in the way of believing that Christ was God. We do not care to have these difficulties pressed home to us in the form of a dreadful alternative, and we should not apply to others reasoning which we do not like applied to ourselves. It is neither fair nor wise to impale an inquirer on the horns of a dilemma which, after all, may only have its existence by a fallacy in our own logic.

We cannot conclude without a protest against an argument used both by Mr. Farrar and the Bishop of

Ely. It is that of connecting the profligacy or the outrages of an era with speculative difficulties in religious belief. To the 'infidelity' of the eighteenth century Mr. Farrar ascribes the profligacy of that century, culminating in France in the atrocities of the Revolution. To the atheism of the eighteenth century the Bishop of Ely ascribes the recent outrages of the Communists in Paris. This is a kind of reasoning stereotyped in England, and sanctioned unfortunately by the stately eloquence of Robert Hall. But it is reasoning which has no definite data and which admits of diverse conclusions. The influence of Spinoza in England is only imaginary, and nothing that he taught could have done harm to any one. Hobbes had a great influence on speculation, but we only dream when we suppose that an abstract philosopher has any immediate influence on the morality of the people. The profligacy of the eighteenth century in England was inherited from the seventeenth, and then it was due far more to the Stuart kings and the servile clergy than to any speculative infidelity. This has its parallel in the history of France. The atrocities of the French Revolution were not due to Diderot or D'Alembert, not even to Voltaire or Robespierre. They were due to the Popes and the French kings, who kept the Church and the people in bondage, and they were due to the French bishops who sold the liberties of the Church and the freedom of religion that they might bask in the sunshine of a king's court.* The priests who have been recently murdered

* See on this subject the excellent article by Dr. Dorner, of Berlin, in the *Contemporary Review* for July, 1871.

in Paris owed their murder less to infidelity or atheism, than to the unfaithful bishops of the time of Louis XIV.

It is certain, as we have already said, that we are on the eve of a great change as to the meaning of Christianity. Dogmas which once were to us the expression of absolute truth, are slowly but surely vanishing before our eyes. We can no longer regard Christianity as embracing all truth, or as marking the confines of revelation. God, who has been shown to be immanent in nature, is immanent also in the mind of man. We can no longer make the distinction between what God teaches and what we learn by means of our faculties, for all our knowledge must in some sense be co-ordinated under revelation. God gave us our faculties, and what we learn by them we learn from Him. It is not indeed without a struggle that we relinquish old beliefs. We feel as the poet did when he says:—

‘ I remember, I remember,
The fir trees dark and high ;
I used to think their slender tops
Did reach unto the sky.
It was a childish ignorance,
But now 'tis little joy
To know I'm farther off from Heaven
Than when I was a boy.’

Yet the new faith may be deeper than the old, and not to put aside the beliefs of childhood may be the greatest unbelief. We crave a point where we can stand and say with certainty that now we know. But no such point is given us. In every case we are thrown finally on faith. It may be in a Church infallibly teaching us, or a Bible that speaks of the

faith of those who have gone before, or in an all-pervading Spirit, slowly rearing the fabric of creation, bringing it to perfection in the roll of ages, and developing Himself in a mysterious way in nature and the human soul. Our life is a walk of faith. We should see it precisely as it is. We should not say there is light where there is only darkness. We should not tell lies for God or invent evidences where there are none. This is following our own way, and not submitting to God's way. It is true, as one of these lecturers says, that Christianity is not worn out, but it is also true that it gasps for freedom. We have made our narrow reasonings the laws and the limits for other men's faith, and God is saying, 'Who hath required this at your hands?'

X.

GERMAN THEOLOGY: ITS PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGION.*

AMONG the books of mystical theology which belonged to the era of the pre-Reformation Mystics, there was one called 'Theologia Germanica,' or 'German Theology.' It was a great favourite with Luther, by whom it was edited and recommended to the people. Luther's friends were afraid that he might injure his cause by identifying himself with the theology of this book. 'We shall be called,' they said, 'German theologians,' and Luther answered bravely, 'It is well; German theologians let us be.' In tracing the course of religious development in Germany, it is necessary to bear in mind this original connection of the Lutheran Reformation with the theology of the Mystics.

In the middle ages, and within the united fold of the Catholic Church, there existed the same diverse tendencies which were more definitely developed after

* Contemporary Review, November, 1871.

History of Protestant Theology. By DR. J. A. DORNER. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1871.
History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. By K. R. HAGENBACH, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1870.

History of Rationalism. By JOHN F. HURST, D.D. London. Trübner & Co. 1867.

the Reformation. While Anselm said, 'Credo ut intelligam,' Abelard answered, 'Intelligo ut credam,' Anselm took the doctrines of the Church on the authority of the Church, trusting to a verification in the religious experience, while Abelard wished to believe only what was known to be true. The Mystics again, with an inner self-consciousness of the truth of religion, tried to be independent both of authority and reason. In the depth of their own spirits there was an answer to the divine mysteries. Deep called unto deep. The consciousness of the divine communication refused to be disturbed by any external voice. The soul internally purified and enlightened recognised the truth of the Scriptures or the doctrines of the Church; but its purification and enlightenment proceeded from another source. It might have been helped by these, but essentially it was independent of them.

The religious element in the German Reformation was mainly contributed by Luther himself. It began with that inward struggle for mental peace which ended in a sense of the divine forgiveness. This was realised by faith, after all efforts by means of ecclesiastical prescriptions and external works had failed. But faith as understood by Luther was not believing the Bible or believing the Church. It was not the reception of orthodox doctrines. It was rather an actual realisation of the unseen, a feeling of contact with the divine, and a sense of participating in that spiritual strength which makes saints and prophets. This in its foundation was Luther's justifying faith. It came to him through his experience in the form of recon-

ciliation. A sense of sin gave him trouble, a sense of divine mercy brought him peace. In Luther's theology this justifying faith in what we may call its scientific form, becomes the first ground of certainty. It is the foundation of all other certainties. It is not preceded by believing the truth of Christianity; but, on the contrary, the truth of Christianity follows from it. In this sense it is the article of 'a standing or a falling Church.'

So far Luther is at one with the Mystics. Like them he begins with the subjective, and from this proceeds to establish the objective. He is personally conscious of being taken out of a state where all was discordant, and of being brought into a state where all is harmonious. For want of better names he uses the current ecclesiastical language, and calls the one a state of nature, the other a state of grace. But he finds other men who have had the same experience. He finds that such men have existed in all ages. Their existence is a fact. These men constitute the Church. Here is the first passage from the subjective to the objective, and here begins Luther's essential antagonism with the Church of Rome. All his language concerning the ministry and the sacraments must be understood from the point of view that true Christians alone are really members of the Church. The right of performing the offices of the Church belongs to them, springs from them, and, for the sake of order, is by them conferred on the officers of the Church.

The Scriptures being the property of this Church, and the canon itself being determined by the Church, they cannot have an external or legal authority over

the Christian's faith. The subject-matter attests itself to the hearts of men as the Word of God; but the canon in itself as a formal principle is without authority. The Christian consciousness is above it. What Luther called justifying faith was the authoritative criterion of canonicity. On this ground he rejected the Epistle of James, which he supposed to contradict the doctrine of St. Paul, and St. Paul's doctrine he did not take on St. Paul's authority, but because he had himself experienced its truth. Dr. Dörner * mentions several books, both in the Old and the New Testament, which Luther either rejected altogether or made deutero-canonical. He did not hesitate to admit that the writers of the Bible were not always correct in their statements nor sound in their arguments. The Scriptures contained the Word of God, but they were not themselves that Word, neither in their form nor, altogether, in their subject-matter. The Scriptures Luther said are but Christ's servant. He was satisfied to have on his side 'the Master and the Lord of Scripture.'

These views of the Bible are clearly and frequently enunciated in Luther's writings, but they are never stated systematically or in the way of dogma. It is also true that many passages might be found which do not harmonize with these views. Lessing quotes Luther as calling the Scriptures on one occasion God Himself, and on another the very body of Christ. But Luther's language, beyond that of all other men, is not to be taken in the strictness of the letter. These expressions themselves bear witness of an

* Vol. i. p. 243.

original tendency to the extravagant and undefined language of the Mystics. Yet his arguments, especially against the Roman Catholics, really assumed the objective certainty and external authority of the Scriptures. Münzer, the leader of the Anabaptists, who rested all truth on the inward light, said that Luther took the same ground as the Roman Catholics, with only this difference, that he substituted the authority of the Bible for that of the Church.

The Reformed Church took up a more decided position than Luther's as to the authority of the Scriptures. This may have been due to the practical character of Zwingle's intellect, or it may have been necessitated by circumstances. The Anabaptists by their lawlessness had brought contempt on immediate inspiration, while the Catholics had an argument easily comprehended by the ordinary mind in the infallibility of the Church. Zwingle regarded the canonical Scriptures as a revelation of the divine will, and at the same time a rule of faith and life. They were a protection against the subjectivity from which Luther started and a refuge from the mere spiritualism of the Anabaptists. Their authority, however, was not even with Zwingle a mere outward law, but a law which became 'clear and sure' only to the believer's mind. Zwingle says that all Scripture is not Holy Scripture, nor are all the sacred writers infallible. The religious truth in the Scriptures is the Word of God. But Zwingle rejected the authority of the Church for the canon. He excluded the Apocalypse, on the same ground that Luther excluded some other books. Beginning with the objective, he fell back on

the subjective, probably without consciousness of the change. Calvin took up Zwingli's position, but held to it with more consistency. He refused the authority of the Church, on the ground that the Church itself was based on the Scriptures. The authority of the Scriptures depends on the Holy Ghost, who speaks in them, testifying of their truth more clearly than any human evidence could do. It is true that this testimony, in the first instance, is connected with the subject-matter, but the latter, in Calvin's judgment, is inseparable from the form of the Scriptures. The Book, as a book, is inspired. Calvin cannot therefore allow the same freedom of criticism which was allowed by Luther. Dr. Dorner remarks in agreement with this that the chief confessions of the Reformed Churches enumerate the writings which form the canon. This is not done in any Lutheran confession, so that with the Lutheran the inclusion of any book in the canon is not an article of faith.

To the living faith of Luther the voice of God was speaking throughout creation. The Church, tradition, the Bible, the sacraments, were all to him the Word of God. His successors, however, came nearer to the Reformed Churches, till at last the Scriptures not only contained the Word of God, but were themselves the Word of God formally and exclusively. The bond of the Church's union was no more, as with Luther, the sense of contact with the divine, but a written book which became an external rule of faith. To suit this position, it was necessary that there be no question of the canonicity of any of the received books, and the entire contents of the Scriptures must

be without the least admixture of error. At this stage the Protestant mind began, we may say, to reflect on its position, and to take an inventory of the contents of Protestantism. It found the objective method of Calvin more convenient, and, indeed, more serviceable, than the method of Luther. The practical mind wants an external law whose authority is the same to all sorts and conditions of men. To meet this want, many things were assumed concerning the Scriptures, and on the basis of these assumptions many arguments were founded systematically and logically. The Holy Spirit was supposed to have committed the office of teaching entirely to the Scriptures. The 'self-certainty of faith' yielded to the inspiration of vowel points and Hebrew accents. Before the close of the seventeenth century this view of the Scriptures was generally received by all Protestant Churches. It was defended by the negative argument that if the Scriptures are not infallible, then we have no infallible authority, and as such an authority was longed for, it was assumed that it must be given. After this conclusion it was quite logical to admit no doubts concerning the books which composed the canon, no various readings nor any uncertainty as to the absolute accuracy of every word and every letter. Calovius said that the writers of Scripture were God's amanuenses, and that the books, even those which were mere history, were the same as if they had been written by Christ's own hand. Nitzsche, the Superintendent of Gotha, proceeded to yet greater extravagance, determining that the Scriptures were not a creature, but that, like God, they

were uncreated. By the Scriptures he understood Luther's translation of the Bible, the very typographical errors of which Dr. Dorner says were to be left untouched.

The only protesters against this apotheosis of the Scriptures in the seventeenth century were such Mystics as Jacob Böhme and Pietists like Spener and John Arndt. These men preserved the subjective principle of Luther, but without being able to give an account of it to reason. The Orthodox, on the other hand, had, by a certain kind of reasoning, reasoned themselves into their position. Their real enemy was the Deism which they had themselves evoked. Deism met them on their own ground, and overcame them by the pure force of a clearer and more consistent logic. As a matter of history it is known that Deism came into Germany from England. The books of the English Deists were translated into German. But the ground was prepared. The same causes which had operated in England were at work in Germany. The genesis of Deism was found in the impossibility of proving the Scriptures to be what the Orthodox assumed them to be. Christianity was made to rest on the supposed authority of writings, the early history of which was not absolutely known, and on the certainty of a canon of whose origin nobody knew anything.

There was, however, another factor in Deism which strengthened its position against the Orthodox. This was natural religion, which embraced what may be known of God from nature and reason, independently of the Scriptures. Over against the uncertainty of

the sacred books, both as to their history and contents, the Deists placed the certainty of natural religion. Subjectivity or that internal certainty which might have rivalled at least the certainty of natural religion, had been put aside, so that from it no resistance could be made. This was equally true in Germany and in England. The precursors of the Deists were the theologians who applied reason to theology. Bacon and Locke, Leibnitz and Wolff, wished to confine their methods only to philosophy, or, if they touched theology, to draw the line very clearly between religion natural and revealed. They seem to have supposed that it was possible to awaken the mind to the utmost activity in one sphere, and to confine it there when another sphere impinged on that, and was really inseparable from it. The 'Aufklärung' dispelled the illusion.

There were, however, in Germany in the eighteenth century theologians who opposed Deism, and yet saw the necessity of admitting the truth concerning the Scriptures. We cannot quite put Bengel in this connection, though he was one of the first who made the critical study of the Bible the great business of his life. He wished to restore the true text, believing that infallibility was connected with the original if it could be found. Bengel proceeded from the Pietists; but he cleared the way for Wetstein and Michaelis, in whose hands the uncertainty, both of the text and the canon, could not be concealed. Rational views of the Bible were taught in many pulpits and universities, but those who taught them were persecuted as unbelievers. Ernesti laid the foundation for a new school

of exegetics. He dispelled the illusive halo with which the Scriptures had been surrounded. He cleared away the mist of allegories, and challenged the cloudy images to declare themselves either gods or men. With clear and purified eyes he saw that whatever might be the meaning of inspiration, the Scriptures were written in human language, and by the laws of human language they must be understood. The divine, he said, had not destroyed the human; and who could tell but that by a clear and open recognition of the human the divine might be more manifest? Ernesti was followed by Semler, who had been educated among the Pietists, and who resolutely opposed Deism in every form. Semler early in life felt that the Scriptures had been deified, and that the destruction of this idolatry must be the work of his life. He could find no external certainty as to the number of canonical books, and when he applied the subjective test, he found that he must reject many of the Old Testament and some of the New. Semler did not solve the great question. He did not speak the right word; but he showed the necessity that it should be spoken. He rejected from the canon some books which had quite as good a claim to canonicity as some that were retained. He made, however, the important distinction between what is local and what is permanent in the Scriptures, and he supposed that some of the writers of the New Testament accommodated themselves to the popular ideas and even superstitions of the Jews of their day.

The Orthodox and the Deists were agreed that Christianity cannot be true if the Scriptures are not

infallible. The Deists said they were certain that the Scriptures were full of errors, while Rational Christians said that Bible infallibility was altogether an invention of theologians. The Scriptures did not claim to be infallible, and Christianity did not rest on their supposed infallibility. The subject was first discussed in a complete form by Lessing. In 1774-77 he published the famous 'Fragments of a Wolfenbüttel Unknown.' Lessing said that he had found the 'Fragments' in MS. in the library of Wolfenbüttel, to which he had been appointed librarian. They are part of a work, the original of which is still to be seen in the town library of Hamburg. It was written by Professor Reimarus, and is called a 'Vindication of the Rational Worshippers of God.' In these 'Fragments' there is no levity, no scoffing, no effort to conceal the ultimate meaning. They are rather written with an impressive earnestness and with the utmost frankness. The perspicuity of the language and the elegance of the style have secured them a permanent place among German classics. It was these qualities which made them suitable for Lessing's object. They showed that the Deists really had something to say against Christianity as it was then understood. Reimarus had been educated for the ministry in the Lutheran Church, but he could not reconcile the Theism of reason with what was ascribed to God in the Scriptures.

The 'Fragments' were six in number, or seven if we reckon one 'On the Toleration of the Deists,' which took the form of an introduction. The first was 'On the Condemnation of Reason from the

Pulpit.' The writer finds it true even of the most learned and inquiring men, that they generally keep to the religion in which they were educated. A blind faith is convenient. It is inculcated by the clergy of all nations. For this, however, ministers of the Christian religion have not the example of Christ and his apostles. They established a rational religion, and appealed to reason against the religion of the Pagans. It is true that St. Paul says, concerning the things of God, that they are foolishness to the natural man. But he is not here contrasting the darkness of reason with the light of revelation. The contrast is between the *psychical* or sensuous man and the spiritual man. St. Paul, in an epistle to the Corinthians, speaks of the reason being taken captive to the obedience of Christ. This passage is often misquoted; instead of the words 'of Christ,' it is generally read *of faith*. But St. Paul is not opposing reason. He only condemns certain false 'reasonings' of the Corinthians. Under the figure of a warfare, he describes their reasonings as subdued by the Gospel. It was commonly argued by the clergy that reason had lost its power through the fall. To this the writer of the 'Fragments' answers, that the reason of the first men could not have been great, when they listened to the words of the serpent and disobeyed the clear command of God. The reason of man is not surely weaker now than it was then. It is impossible that we could be so weak as to sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression. The Scriptures lay the foundation of faith in reason. The Lutherans 'reason' against election and reprobation, as contrary to the goodness

of God. The Reformed 'reason' against the ubiquity of Christ's natural body, because it is against the nature of such a body to be in more places than one at the same time; and both Lutheran and Reformed 'reason' against transubstantiation, because it contradicts our very ideas of what constitutes bread and wine. The clergy may decry reason, yet they must use it.

The second 'Fragment' is on the 'Impossibility of a Revelation which all men could receive in a Satisfactory Manner.' By 'revelation' we are evidently to understand revelation in the ordinary sense of an external or merely objective revelation. It is first supposed as possible that God might give a supernatural revelation to all men at all times. But this would imply continual miracles, which would destroy the established order of nature. It would be against the wisdom of God, who, if divine knowledge was to be given to all men, would give it in a natural way. To work miracles continually would be like teaching men supernaturally where to find fire and water, meat and drink, instead of giving them eyes which they could use for themselves. If all men had lost the use of their eyes by the fall, it is not likely that God would have sent angels to lead men, or indeed have adopted any supernatural way of compensating for the loss of sight. It is more likely, and more in accordance with divine wisdom, that He would at once have restored the use of their eyes. It is also possible that God would have given a supernatural revelation to some persons in every country, from whom all others were to receive it. But here again, as the object is

that it should extend to all, the same improbability of frequent miracles is opposed. Moreover, in this case the miracles would not effect their object. Those who received the revelation at second-hand would not receive a divine revelation, but only the testimony of men that such a revelation had been made. The miracles, at first believed by only a few, as the case was with the Jews, would become less credible to those who did not see them. The third case conceivable is that of God revealing Himself at certain times, and through certain persons, to one nation. This hypothesis has some advantage over the others, but it supposes that to be done by miracles which could be done through the ordinary working of nature. Moreover, of the evidence of such a revelation not one in a million could have the opportunity of judging, so as to be reasonably convinced of its truth. This is not God's way of acting in the natural world. He does not suspend matters of great moment on mere accidents. If the revelation in the Bible is to be taken for this one revelation which is necessary for salvation, it was simply impossible that all men could know it. Noah and the patriarchs to whom it was first given took no pains to publish it. They cultivated fields and planted vineyards. Even at the present day only a small number of the human race have heard the Gospel. St. Paul, indeed, speaks of its sound having gone out into all lands, and of its being preached to every creature under heaven. But many maps must have been missing in the apostle's atlas. He doubtless meant that the religion of nature was published in all lands. The voice of God, speaking

to the reason of man, is the only Gospel that has been preached to every creature under heaven.

The third 'Fragment' is on the 'Passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea.' The narrative says that there were 600,000 armed men. Reckoning for wives, children, and unarmed, four to every armed man, we have a company of 3,000,000, which probably had 300,000 oxen, with 600,000 sheep and goats. For fodder and baggage they must have required about 5,000 waggons. Pharaoh's army had at least 600 waggons and probably 25,000 cavalry, with 100,000 foot soldiers. These followed close on the Israelites when they encamped on the shore of the Red Sea. The wind blew all night, which probably means till midnight, before the sea was dry. By the first watch—that is, in three hours' time—the Israelites had crossed the sea, and the Egyptians were in the middle of it, with their horses and chariots. The camp of the Israelites is reckoned to have covered at least nine square miles. The argument is, that it was just possible for one person to have walked the distance in three hours, but utterly impossible for such a multitude of people.

In the fourth 'Fragment' it is maintained 'that the Books of the Old Testament were not written to reveal a Religion.' This is shown from their silence as to any future life, which it is assumed must be the object of a supernatural religion. This was written in avowed opposition to Warburton's argument that the legation of Moses must have been divine because he said nothing of immortality, or of rewards and punishments in a life to come. The passages in Job and the

Psalms, with some in the Prophets, which are generally supposed to refer to a future life, are explained in another sense. The doctrine, if presupposed in the Scriptures, was certainly either not known or not believed among the Jews. Some of the Old Testament writers plainly deny it. The Jews borrowed it from the Persians, the Greeks, and the Egyptians. In the time of Christ it was believed by the Pharisees, but denied by the Sadducees, who were the old orthodox Jews.

The fifth 'Fragment' was on 'The History of the Resurrection.' This was the severest piece of criticism that had ever been applied to the Gospel histories. St. Matthew's account of the guard appointed by Pilate is not reckoned worthy of belief. It is not only not mentioned by any other evangelist, but no apostle ever speaks of the guard as witnesses of the resurrection. There were many occasions when this might have been of great service to the apostles, especially when they were brought before the Roman governors; but never once do they allude to it. That the body was stolen is more probable than St. Matthew's story of the guard. It is asked why Jesus did not rise in the day-time, when the people might have seen Him? why did He not, after His resurrection, show Himself before the officers? why He did not appear in the Temple, or in the public streets? It is strange that all His visits were to His disciples, and that they were made privately and mysteriously. The 'Fragment' ends by pointing out ten palpable contradictions in the Gospel narratives.

There was an additional 'Fragment' published after

these five. This was larger than all the others together, and appeared in the midst of the controversy which the others had created. It is generally supposed not to have been written by Reimarus, or, if written by him, to have been intended chiefly to provoke the zealots. The scope of it is, that John and Jesus preached the kingdom of God in the sense understood by the old prophets of the restoration of the grandeur of the Jewish kingdom. The people who heard them, and even Christ's own disciples, always understood it in this sense. But after the failure to make Jesus a temporal king, they began to think of another kingdom, which was not to be on earth, but in heaven.

Lessing published these 'Fragments' expressly to have the questions raised in them more thoroughly discussed. He added notes of his own, expressing in many cases his dissent from the writer, and sometimes answering his objections. He rested the certainty of Christianity on the experience of those who have realised its spirit in their own consciousness. A paralytic, he says, who has felt the beneficial effects of the sparks of electricity, is not concerned to know whether its discovery is due to Nollet or to Franklin. The letter is not the spirit, and the Bible is not the religion. Objections against the letter of the Bible are not objections against the spirit of the religion which is in the Bible. Almost in the words of Richard Baxter, Lessing says that the Scriptures contain more than what belongs to religion. There is a human element with the divine. Moreover, Christianity existed before either the Gospels or the Epistles were

written; and it was a long time in existence before the entire canon was formed. It is therefore impossible that the truth of the Christian religion can depend on these writings. It is not true because it was taught by evangelists and apostles, but they taught it because it is true. These writings could not give it inner truth if it had none in itself. Assaults on the Bible merely affected the outworks of Christianity and did not touch the citadel.

On the first 'Fragment,' Lessing says that the clergy have entirely ceased to denounce reason. The chief thing heard in the pulpits is its agreement with faith. The common saying now is that revelation is nothing else but a renewed sanction of the religion of reason. The second 'Fragment' is admitted to contain a multitude of things that are not to be questioned. Yet surely if a revelation is useful and necessary, it is better that it be given to some and not withheld altogether. The assumption that they only can be saved who have received this revelation is neither, Lessing says, the doctrine of Christ nor the universally acknowledged doctrine of the Church. On the third 'Fragment' Lessing referred to the explanation that had often been given that the 600,000 might have been a mistake of the copyist for 600. He said that the miracle of Elijah dividing the waters of the Jordan with his mantle to make a passage for himself, was quite as wonderful as Moses dividing the Red Sea that millions might pass over. He shows the conceivability of the Israelites having made the passage in the time mentioned. On the fourth 'Fragment' Lessing admits that the Jews were

ignorant of immortality. We may even, he says, go further, and admit that before the Babylonian captivity they had not a right conception of the unity of God. It is certain that the unity which they ascribed to God was not that transcendental metaphysical unity which is the foundation of all natural theology. Or if some did reach it, certainly it was not grasped by the people, who could not be restrained from falling into idolatry and going after strange gods, who were to them also gods, but not so powerful as Jehovah, their national Deity. To his remarks on this 'Fragment' Lessing adds the famous treatise on the 'Education of the Human Race,' which he says had been in circulation among some friends, and from which he confesses that he had himself borrowed some ideas.

By regarding revelation as the education of the race, it is supposed that many difficulties in theology may be removed. By education we educe what is in an individual, and so revelation brings out what is already in the race. Human reason would itself have reached the conclusions of revelation, but it would have required a much longer time. The parallel, however, is preserved. The mode of revelation like that of education is progressive. God begins with the Hebrew race and reveals Himself 'the God of their fathers.' By miracles He testifies that He is greater and mightier than any other god. It was not yet time to teach this race the immortality of the soul. They had not capacity to understand any higher good than temporal prosperity. When the child came of age it was sent into foreign countries. Here it

learned the blessings of the home it had left, and yet it found some who had got beyond it in learning, just as some self-educated men surpass those who have been taught at the schools. The Jews learned from the Persians to think of God as 'Being of all beings.' This, indeed, they might have discovered in their own books had their reason been sufficiently developed, but it was not. Revelation hitherto had guided their reason, and now reason gives clearness to their revelation. Among the Persians and Chaldeans, and in the schools of Alexandria, the Jews learned the doctrine of immortality. There may have been hints of it and allusions to it in their own Scriptures, but they were not clear, and so it never became the creed of more than a section of the Jewish people. The Old Testament was to the Jews like a primer to a child. It only contained what they were to learn as children. It clothed in allegories such abstract truths as creation and the origin of evil. The primer served the childhood of the race, but it was exhausted when Christ came. He tore it from the child's hands. Christ was the first *certain* teacher. Prophecies were fulfilled in Him, He wrought miracles, He revealed the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. It may not now be possible to *prove* Christ's miracles or His resurrection, or even to know who He was in the mysteries of His nature and person. But these have not the same importance for the recognition of truth which they once had. Christ was the first *practical* teacher, the first who taught men to live here as believers in a life to come. This doctrine is contained in the New Testament, the second primer which was given for the

instruction of the race in the second stage of its capacity. The possibility of a third age is mentioned when men will do right without reference to the future, but because it *is* right. Every individual of the race must travel over the same road of progressive education. To allow time for this it is supposed that men may have lived before, or that they may have opportunities of learning in the eternity that is to come.

The objections of the Deists to Christianity, and the answers to these objections, reached their final stage in the Wolfenbüttel 'Fragments,' and the controversies which followed their publication. The Deists had made an 'Aufklärung,' but the philosophy of Kant, which went again to subjectivity and concerned itself with the nature of reason, *cleared up* a great deal which the Deists took for immovable certainty. Kant's philosophy had no immediate reference to religion, and was so far neither against Christianity nor for it. The service it rendered was an equal benefit to both sides. It cleared the ground, removed the dust, and distinguished between the mountain and the mirage, or at least determined the conditions under which it was possible to make the distinction. Kant's problem in philosophy was the parallel problem of theology. Philosophers and theologians had been making systems on the assumption that the objective, if not perfectly known, was, at least, perfectly knowable. The Deists contrasted the certainty of their reasonings with the uncertainty of the external evidences of Christianity. Kant showed the uncertainty of their reasonings. To set one uncertainty against another was not to increase the grounds of faith, but

it taught men to look deeper into the foundations of what constitutes certainty. It turned the human mind to the examination of itself, and to estimate the value of subjective knowledge. Kant in this was a true German and a Lutheran too, for he shaped into the form of science what had been left indefinite by Luther.

Kant himself rested religion on morality, that is, he found the proper basis of religion in the moral law within, which he held to be the most certain of all things. This moral law was God in the conscience. From it Kant learned the doctrine of immortality and of a judgment to come. In Christianity he found the religion which best answered to the moral nature of man. The historical Christ was the ideal whom all men ought to have before them. The Church was an institution required by the condition of man in the world, and the doctrines of Christianity, such as original sin, moral freedom, and in a sense atonement, corresponded to the facts of man's moral nature. The law in the mind becomes, in Kant's philosophy, the schoolmaster which leads to Christ. But as that philosophy never reaches objective certainty as to the existence of God, much less can it ever reach the certainty of an external revelation.

The religious part of Kant's system was only meagrely expressed by himself. Jacobi exchanged the word morality for faith, but the meaning remained in a great measure the same. This faith was a feeling or inward knowledge of re-creation—a sense of God abiding in the soul. Jacobi says that the great desire of his life had been to attain to certainty on the

anticipations of man. He believed in no philosophy except this. The certainty he desired he could only find within in his own spirit. There he found 'an absolute knowledge springing directly from the human reason.' Revelation was made to man's inmost nature. It was perceived by reason, but never grasped by the understanding. It could not be shaped into a science. It could not become objective without suffering injury and perversion. A revelation from without, however it might be provided with miracles, could never be satisfactory. In Christ and Christianity Jacobi recognised all that the moral nature or higher reason required in us, but before Christianity can be really believed, all that is vital in Christ must become living in us.

Fichte, too, like Jacobi and Kant, found certainty only in subjectivity. For morality or faith, he substituted love as the essential principle or basis of religion. This difference at first sight seems considerable. To many, and even to Fichte himself, it was. Kant and Jacobi had recognised in Christianity, as contained in the whole New Testament, the religion suited to man's nature. Fichte recognised in Christ the absolute perfection of love and purity. But starting as he did with love instead of morality, which with Kant was the sense of an absolute righteousness, he clung to John as the only true evangelist and interpreter of the mind of Jesus. This evangelist alone reports the words in which Jesus announced the principle of certainty—that he who did the will of the Father should know of the doctrine. With Fichte too, as with John, the subjectivity took a mystical

form. The knowledge of things divine depended on the union of the soul with God; on the finite passing into the Infinite. Through the deepest philosophy Fichte was led to the faith of the simple Christian, believing in eternal life because he had already realised its blessedness.

In the last section of his work, Dr. Dorner treats of the regeneration of Protestant theology in the nineteenth century. This has been effected by removing the partiality of the objectivity which prevailed from the beginning of the seventeenth century, and the partiality of the subjectivity which began with Kant and reached its climax in Fichte. In his philosophy the intellect of man projected the external world. The I alone existed, or, if it evoked an object, that object was the Infinite in which the I immediately disappeared. To determine the reality both of the subjective and the objective, the finite and the Infinite, their co-existence and mutual relations, was the object of Schelling and Hegel. The same was done by Schleiermacher in the sphere of religion. In this Dorner says, Schleiermacher only returned to the principle of the Reformation—that truth is authenticated to consciousness by the agency of the Holy Ghost. By that agency the contemplation of the historical Christ becomes a divine faith. It is a contact with the divine, and thereby a sense of delivery from sin and of reconciliation with the sinless. German Protestantism, after its long conflict, now rests on the truth of the subject-matter of the Scriptures, but certified through subjectivity leaving the form open to the freest criticism.

The same questions that have been dealt with by the Germans have come up in different forms and at different times in England. Their history is parallel in both countries, but the English mind has been more timid in its treatment of them. Theology with us has never been a science. The Church of England at the Reformation followed the Lutheran confessions, and, like them, had at first no fixed canon of Scripture. It was not till the reign of Elizabeth, when the second generation of Reformers returned from Switzerland, that the Sixth Article was added to the Articles of Religion. The English Reformation then entered on the Helvetian stage, and rested like Calvin and the Church of Geneva on the objectivity of the Scriptures. The Sixth Article enumerates the canonical books of the Old Testament, and declares canonical those of the New that are 'commonly received,' describing them as those 'of whose authority there never was any doubt in the Church.' Here we have a definite canon of Scripture with authority, and on the Scripture the Church itself was based. Nothing was to be taught which could not be 'read therein nor proved thereby.' The first defenders of Episcopacy, such as Whitgift, Hooker, and Bridges, drew their arguments from reason and antiquity. This was not indeed forbidden by the Article, but the Puritans had an apparent advantage in the simple fact that they rested solely on the Scriptures. The later defendants of Episcopacy appealed to Scripture, but in connection with antiquity as the interpreter of Scripture. All parties kept to the canon, and to the Church only as resting on the canon. The dependence of the Church on the Scrip-

tures was a principle which some Churchmen from their position might have wished to deny; but no such tendency was ever manifested by any of the old theologians of the Church of England. The Puritans intensified the spirit of the Sixth Article. In the Westminster Confession, all the books were enumerated, both of the Old and the New Testaments. They were expressly, even as to their form, declared the 'Word of God,' and said to be 'given by inspiration.' In accordance with the doctrine of Calvin, the assurance of their infallible truth is said to come from 'the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts.' It is evident here that the inspired rule of faith is not the subject-matter only but the formal canon.

Towards the end of the seventeenth century some of the Puritans adopted from Buxtorf the doctrine of the inspiration of vowel points and Hebrew accents. The most eminent Churchmen, on the other hand, do not seem ever to have been believers in Bible infallibility. Brian Walton, like Bengel, believed that the original text was infallible, if it could be found. Jeremy Taylor advocated toleration for all sects and opinions, on the express ground of the uncertainty of the Scriptures. Stillingfleet says that in matters of history the writers of the Bible did not require inspiration; and, from internal evidence, he concludes that it was not given, but that the writers were left to their own knowledge. Tillotson reasoned, that if the Scriptures had been infallibly inspired, the same Providence that had taken such care in their composition would have preserved them without corruption or interpolation.

All these writers rested certainty on the inward testimony of the Spirit. This, however, did not extend to the canonicity of books, but only to the truth and divinity of the Christian religion. In the next century the apologists for Christianity against the Deists professed to stand on the infallibility of the Scriptures, and yet they granted almost all that the Deists wished. In England theology made no progress after the Deist controversy.

The books which we have placed at the head of this article give the results of German thinking since the Reformation. It is impossible for us to take another step in theology if we ignore what the Germans have said and done. This presses on us at every hand. It is a normal part of the history and development of Protestantism. We have the alternatives of renouncing Protestantism and inventing for ourselves the idea of a Church on which we may lean so long as it will support us, or we can denounce all German theology as Rationalism, and take our stand on the Scriptures as if the canon were objectively certain and the inspiration of every word infallible. One or both of these is generally done in England. Both methods are empirical—mere inventions that cannot be defended; and the result, Dr. Dorner says, is that we in England are not beyond the danger of a return to Deism. Neither the Church party nor the Bible party can stand on their own ground. They mutually derive their strength from each other's weakness. The Church party, contrary to the old spirit of the Church of England, makes the Bible uncertain, that it may exalt the Church, and the Bible party finds it easy to

reduce the Church theory to an assumption which has no other foundation but the desire that it may be true.

The English intellect is essentially empirical and utilitarian. It has never fairly given itself to the study of divinity forgetful of everything but truth. It has never looked in the face the real facts of the universe and of God's government. The first step of its reasoning in religion has always been an assumption that something must be as it is supposed to be, or if not we have no certainty. The German intellect, on the other hand, has never been afraid. It has laid bare every assumption. It has had the deep faith that if God's way be through doubt and difficulty, that way must be followed, just because it is God's way. The men to whom the regeneration of theology is due were mostly men who had been educated for the service of religion, and who preserved through life the character of earnest and devout Christians. At the very time when Fichte was publicly charged with atheism, he never omitted the morning and evening devotions in his family. Lessing was more secular, and his sympathies with the general world were wider, but the influence of his early education was never effaced. Schleiermacher, too, retained to his last days the Moravian piety which he had learned in his father's house.

In trying to sum up the results of the German regeneration of theology, it is necessary to give the first place to the *doctrine of God*. Dr. Dorner and Professor Hagenbach continue to use the word Pantheism, and even to speak of the systems of Schelling

and Hegel as Pantheistic. It is surely time that this word were either better defined or laid aside until a proper definition is found. To take an obscure part of a speculative system, or a system which perhaps in its completeness is but imperfectly understood, and to call it Pantheism, is not the way to make people wiser than they were before. It is notorious that the regenerating elements of German theology have come from what is called Pantheism. Fichte, Herder, and Schleiermacher had to bear the reproach of Pantheism as well as Schelling and Hegel. The old Deists and the old divines who fought the Deists could never rise above the conception of God as a personal Being. He was to them always a man, or at least a Being made in the image of man, dwelling in an inaccessible heaven outside the boundaries of time and space. The great question was, if this Being had ever visited this world or interfered with the order established at creation. The Pantheists, as they were called, opened their eyes upon that order, and saw that God had never been absent from it, that He constituted it, and that in a sense that order was God Himself. This idea was familiar to the Pagan world. Like the self-taught scholars in Lessing's theory of the education of the race, they had outstripped both Christian and Jew. Schiller felt the higher truth of the Pagan idea of God over that of the Deists, and gave open expression to it in the 'Gods of Greece.' This conception of God as immanent everywhere in nature, changed the very meaning of the words natural and supernatural. Both were within the order of nature. The difference was in the effects, and not in the mode of operation.

Revelation itself became conceivable as within the order of nature. It was an education, and the question is still open if we are to consider the education as extending to all by inward revelation, or if, with Lessing, we limit revelation to a special teaching which was to educe in a shorter time what was already in the reason.

With this view of the identity of God and the orderly evolutions both of the natural and the supernatural, corresponds the German doctrine of the Scriptures, as expounded by Dr. Dorner. The certainty of their truth is derived from the Scriptures themselves. The formal principle is declared an insufficient foundation, and with this external evidences become incapable of producing faith. The truth of Christianity must be felt, and it can only be felt by those whose minds are prepared to feel it. This seems to be reasoning in a circle, as the disposition necessary for conviction is itself produced by the contents of the Scriptures; but it only means that the certainty is mainly inward, or at most it is 'subjectively objective.' It is a work in the mind, without which 'it is not possible to perceive that there is a divine revelation, and that this is deposited in Holy Scripture.' It is a matter of faith and not of knowledge. The first thing to be evoked is 'not faith in the normative authority or inspiration of Holy Scripture, or of the Apostles, but faith in Christ as the Redeemer; in other words, experience of justification before God through faith in Him.' A man who has in himself the experience of being delivered from evil, has no fears when he allows to criticism all its rights. Yea, criticism itself is an act

of faith. 'This fact of salvation experienced by faith cannot be made untrue by any critical conclusions whatever.'

We are not ignorant of the reception which this doctrine of subjectivity commonly meets in England. The objection to it is that after all we may have nothing on which we can really depend. Our minds may only project illusions, and our inner consciousness may have no objective answer in the real world. But we must take the facts of religion as they are. This internal certainty may not be all that we could wish it to be; but we are not on that account to make it less than it is, or invent an external certainty which does not exist. Religion in its true essence has ever come from within. It has been preserved by Mystics and Pietists, and most successfully preached by saints and prophets to whom the conviction of its truth was its power to renew the life. That which a man feels is to him the greatest certainty.

Let Protestant England learn from Protestant Germany that the principle of resting Christianity on the formal canon of Scripture is hopeless. Let all theories of inspiration be dismissed, and the books which compose the Scriptures be received as what they are and what they profess to be. If this were done, the common reason of mankind would reject all such theories as that of Strauss concerning the Gospels, and all imaginary biographies of Jesus, like that by M. Rénan. Every theory concerning the Scriptures would be suspected just according to the measure of the ingenuity with which it is supported. It is time that we in England, especially the clergy and all teachers

of religion, should learn the real truth concerning the Scriptures, that every new work on Bible learning may not be, as in recent days it has been, the occasion of a religious panic, and a disturbance to the faith of Christians.

XI.

RECENT ECCLESIASTICAL JUDGMENTS.*

IT used to be urged as a reproach against the Church of England that it was without law. It had often been compared to a ship without a mast or a rudder, driven to and fro by every wind; or to a kingdom without a ruler, where every man did what was right in his own eyes. The diversity of doctrine was indeed great, and notwithstanding all Acts of Uniformity, the modes of worship were many and widely varied. The idea of a comprehensive Church had been realised till the existence of the Church itself seemed to many to be in danger by the very extent of its comprehensiveness. The cords were distended till they were about to break. It had become evident to most people that however wide the boundaries might be made, it was imperative for self-preservation that the line of demarcation be drawn somewhere.

* Contemporary Review, February, 1872.

The Sling and the Stone. Sermons by the Rev. C. VOYSEY. Trübner and Co. 1866—70.

Appeal to the Judicial Committee, &c. By the Rev. C. VOYSEY. Trübner and Co. 1870.

Freedom in the Church of England. Six Sermons suggested by the Voysey Judgment. By the Rev. STOPFORD A. BROOKE. Henry S. King and Co. 1871.

Judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of Hebert v. Purchas. Edited by EDWARD BULLOCK, Esq. Butterworth. 1871.

This as a general principle must be admitted by all, even by those who are condemned by the Judgments. Mr. Voysey, for instance, would exclude a clergyman who taught atheism ; and Mr. Purchas, we suppose, would not extend the shelter of the Church to Papal Infallibility, the Immaculate Conception, or any other Roman dogma which is still ahead of English Ritualists. In their own particular cases they will think the judgments arbitrary. They can both quote men who have taught the same doctrines, or nearly the same, as they teach, and yet have remained in the Church without being molested. It does seem unjust that the law should fall upon one, while another has escaped. It does seem arbitrary that the law should speak at certain times and be silent at other times, or, as it may happen, at some future time pronounce a different judgment from what it has pronounced at present. We may regret these things, but they are among the conditions of life. If the Church had any different government from that of the world, we might look for a fixed infallible judgment, but existence has to be accepted as it is, with its anomalies and imperfections.

We do not start with perfection. It is rather the goal to be reached at the end of the ages of progress. If Mr. Voysey had remembered this, he would not merely not have complained of the judgment passed on him, but he would never have provoked it. Pierre Leroux, speaking of the old religions of the world, says that we have had many to show us the falsehood of these old beliefs, but we now want some one to show us their truth. Mr. Voysey steps over the old

theologies of saints and prophets like a giant stepping over the mud huts that are the dwellings of a feeble people. With the vehemence of a prophet of destruction, he has told us of the falsehood and superstition of the popular beliefs. We should have been more thankful if he had told us how much truth was in them.

The charges against Mr. Voysey concerned the atonement, original sin, justification, the incarnation, and the Holy Scriptures. On all these subjects he maintained that in substance he agreed with the Articles of Religion. But the popular or traditional theology may fairly claim kindred with the Articles. It is simply impossible to deny the one and yet hold by the other. It happens that on the first subject, that of the atonement, one of the Articles says expressly that Christ died to reconcile His Father to us. Another says that He was the propitiation for all the sins of the world, both original and actual. In the popular doctrine of the atonement, there is nothing really stronger than the words of these Articles. Mr. Voysey quotes from the Homilies to show that the 'horrible doctrines' in them, which are the counterpart of popular theology, are not in agreement with the Articles. But as the Homilies and the Articles had the same men for the most part as their authors, we should have reasoned that the one was the proper interpreter of the other.

It is not, we confess, without very considerable effort that we have been able to make out Mr. Voysey's position. So long as he was denouncing what he calls the popular theology, or commonly

received opinions, we thought he might only have before him some extreme form of Calvinism. We can understand a man defending the Articles of Religion, and at the same time opposing doctrines which are mere glosses on the Articles. But the denial both of reconciliation, and the necessity of reconciliation, is contrary to all that we ever understood to be the doctrine of the Church of England. Moreover, we believe it to be impossible to deny, as Mr. Voysey expressly does, the 'Pauline doctrines' of atonement and reconciliation, and yet not contradict the Articles of Religion. The theology of the Reformation was essentially Pauline, so that whatever interpretation be put on St. Paul, the same is applicable to the Articles of Religion. Mr. Voysey's object, we imagine, was simply to avoid direct contradiction of the Church's formularies, expecting that so long as he did this he would have liberty to preach against everything that the Church believed.

The doctrine of the atonement is confessedly a doctrine encompassed with difficulties. When we stand on the ground of simple Theism, it seems unnecessary. In the last century it became the final test of Deism. A man like Mr. Voysey, who believed atonement unnecessary, however much he might have professed belief in Christianity, was regarded as a Deist. And the ground of this was, that the atonement not being a doctrine within the discovery of reason, was purely derived from revelation, and so a matter of mere faith. The Deists, as they were called, rejected it because reason, they said, was against it. The ignorant pagans offered sacrifices to appease their terrible

deities, but the philosophers who believed in one God maintained that the only conditions of forgiveness were repentance and amendment of life. The Deists, therefore, rejected the atonement as allied to paganism, and only acknowledged Christianity as far as it was a republication of the religion of nature.

The men of that day were clear reasoners, but they were not profound. In the present time, whether a man believes or does not believe, what we shall call the Pauline doctrine of the atonement, he cannot say that it is contrary to reason. It will be objected that we merely put it in a rational form. Our answer is, that if it is capable of a rational form, it should not be denounced as 'horrible' and 'hideous.' We do not admit that reason is altogether on Mr. Voysey's side. A doctrine which has taken such universal hold on the religious mind, must have some reason in it. That it has been connected with fearful superstitions it is not necessary to deny. All that we contend for is, that the abstract idea of atonement is in conformity with reason. The highest philosophical conception which we can have of Deity, is that of absolute impersonal justice. He is that Everlasting Order which opposes all disorder. If we look only to the course of this world, we cannot deny that one man suffers for the sins of another. The Divine law is broken, and like every violated law in nature, the consequent suffering falls on all who come within its reach. With this conception of God, we can understand the necessity of what we call an atonement. In Kant's philosophy there was a place found for satisfaction because of the absolute justice of Deity. On this ground, one

school of his disciples were strenuous defenders of the orthodox faith.

If we had capacities to form a theology in conformity with our conceptions of the Absolute, many of our present difficulties on subjects that refer to God and His attributes would disappear. But the question of the atonement is usually discussed in that lower sphere where we think of God as a Being with 'parts and passions.' The objections to the atonement are all anthropomorphic. They ignore the transcendental Unity in which Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one. They make God a person as if He were a man, and take all 'passions' that are ascribed to Him as if they were ascribed literally. When the orthodox say that we are children of wrath, or that Christ has delivered us from wrath, those who object to the atonement think it awful. But is there really anything meant more than that being in antagonism with everlasting Order, we were liable to destruction till Christ delivered us? The 'wrath' is a mere figure, which comes and goes with our conception of God as a person.

The Pauline theology speaks of something which Christ did for man's redemption. This is put in so many forms that it is really impossible to take any of them literally. The cautious John Locke, after a careful study of St. Paul's Epistles, described the atonement as a 'transaction' between God and our Saviour, beyond our ken or guess. We may dislike the word 'transaction.' It is quite as objectionable as price, substitute, or satisfaction. But if we really believe that Christ did something to deliver men from

evil, we may easily find a guide to the true meaning of the forms in which it has been clothed by the language of Pauline or popular theology. Perhaps the best form of expressing the atonement is that in John's Gospel, where Jesus says that He lays down His life for the sheep; or, again, where He speaks of His death as that of one dying for his friends. The same is well expressed by a modern writer, who says that Christ went among 'the wheels of the disordered creation.' We are quite justified in interpreting the language of the apostolic epistles as different modes of representing or illustrating the simple fact, that Christ in some way delivered men. The writers being Jews, and mostly writing for Jews, it is not surprising that they should take their language and their illustrations from the Temple service.

It would doubtless be well if preachers would avoid language which shocks the moral sense, even though it may seem to be sanctioned by Evangelists or Apostles. It was indeed 'horrible' for the late Bishop of Peterborough to describe the climax of Christ's sufferings as being reached when *He fell into his Father's hands*. Figures may be carried too far, and sometimes may even be taken for realities. But we think, in entire opposition to Mr. Voysey, that the language of Pauline theology is not generally pressed to its literal meaning. It is used more frequently as the language of piety. Speaking personally, we have no belief in any form of Calvinism, but we should unwillingly exchange for anything in Mr. Voysey's sermons—

'Rock of ages cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee.'

We do not suppose that God ever literally required to be appeased, nor to have His wrath turned away in any human sense, yet we have no scruples to say or sing—

‘Not all the blood of beasts
On Jewish altars slain,
Could give the guilty conscience peace
Or wash away the stain.
But Christ, the heavenly Lamb,
Takes all our sins away;
A sacrifice of nobler name
And richer blood than they.’

Forms of speech that become popular do not convey to ordinary minds all that they do to those who press them to their last meaning. The verses just quoted do not make people think of wrath and revenge. They are not associated in the devout mind with any repulsive ideas of ‘blood.’ Their one idea is the fact of Divine forgiveness. John Wesley, who is responsible for half the popular religion of England, translated and introduced into his hymn-book a hymn beginning—

‘Jesus, Thy blood and righteousness
My beauty are and glorious dress,’

and yet it is well known that he entirely repudiated the whole doctrine of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness—‘It can never,’ he said, ‘consist with God’s unerring wisdom to think that I am innocent, to judge that I am righteous, because another is so. He could no more in this manner confound me with Christ than with David or Abraham.’ In the hymn we have an idea justifiable in the language of devotion, but which we must not convert into an article of rigid theology.

It is not necessary to follow Mr. Voysey through the whole scene of his warfare with orthodox modes of faith. But if the same principles which we have laid down are applied to the other subjects, it will be found that the orthodox side is not so destitute of reason as he wishes to make it appear. Some of our old divines, as Jeremy Taylor and Daniel Whitby, thought to escape charging original sin on God by charging it on nature, as if God were not responsible for what is done by nature. They admitted a taint or infection of nature which we have inherited, but, like Mr. Voysey, they wished to deny that men are 'by nature children of God's wrath.' This doctrine Mr. Voysey calls 'simply absurd,' and 'pure nonsense.' But it does not appear that the fact of inherited corruption is in any way less absurd than the doctrine of imputed sin. It is philosophically the same idea translated into the language of personification. That there are people who really regard God as a man, and ascribe to Him all the passions of men, is no doubt true, but this is not necessarily inferred from the use of words or ideas that refer to God under the conception of Him as man. The truth in these conceptions is to be acknowledged, and the error to be corrected, by the higher but more difficult conception of God as transcending the limits of human personality. It would be unjust for any judge to impute to one man the sin of another, or to punish one man for the sin of another. But in the Divine proceedings we must look at the whole scheme. The natural world reveals the fact that men are born with inherited infirmities, that the sin of one is visited upon another; in other

words, is imputed. This fact, standing simply by itself, is equally against the justice of God in whatever form it is expressed. But we have not yet seen the whole of the Divine procedure. It is true, indeed, that there are forms of the popular theology which absolutely prevent the possibility of the exercise of Divine justice. Such is the rigid doctrine of election, or the belief that men may suffer eternally for Adam's sin; and perhaps the doctrine of never-ending suffering, which would be an unjust infliction for anything that the worst of men could do in this brief and troubled life. Had Mr. Voysey confined himself to denouncing doctrines absolutely irreconcilable with reason and our sense of justice, he would have been unmolested either by Church Association, Archbishop, or Privy Council.

On justification our Articles clearly adopt the Pauline, Augustinian, or Calvinistic form of expression, that for Christ's merits we are 'accounted righteous.' In other words, we are acquitted, or reckoned just. The idea is forensic, and so far it is a fiction, but the thing intended is no fiction. Mr. Voysey fights against the form as if it were a reality, which is simply the mistake of those who take justification only in a forensic sense. St. Paul's meaning, as addressed to Jews who looked for salvation by ceremonies, or who accounted themselves just, is not, apparently, difficult to discover; and Mr. Voysey seems to have discerned the great significance of this doctrine at the Reformation, as opposed to the sacramental system of the Church of Rome. Indeed, with the light he has on this subject, we wonder what he

can mean by saying that 'we do not need atonement or justification.'

The other judgments have to do with an entirely distinct class of offenders. The same hands which introduced into our formularies the Reformed theology, made Articles and rubrics condemning and protesting against the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome. That these had been dealt with distinctly in express Articles, had always, until our day, been reckoned a sure barrier against their re-introduction into the Church of England. But a party has arisen that our fathers knew not. It affects, indeed, to find its genealogy in the High Church divines of the seventeenth century. But these divines, even the most advanced of them, as, for instance, Andrewes, Laud, Cosin, and Sancroft, were decided Protestants. They were not ashamed of the English Reformation. They revered the names of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley. This party, on the other hand, finds in the Reformation only apostacy, and in the Reformers 'scoundrelism.' It has been trying, first by stealth and now openly, to establish what it calls 'Catholicism' or 'Catholic truth' within the bosom of a Church whose Articles of Religion are mainly occupied in repudiating the very heresies and superstitions which this party calls 'Catholic truth.'

In addition to the Articles, changes were made at the Reformation in the services of the Church which were themselves a constant and public protest against the Roman doctrines rejected in the Articles. To undo these changes was, therefore, a great object for the party that was bringing back 'Catholic truth.'

The clergy at St. Alban's, Holborn, had proceeded so far in the direction of the Roman use as to elevate the consecrated elements, to use incense, to mix water with the communion wine, and to burn candles during the celebration of the Eucharist. At the request of the bishop of the diocese, and with a growing sense of their illegality, some of these practices were discontinued before the judgment was given in the Court of Arches. The charges, however, were proved, and a monition issued to the Incumbent that they be discontinued. The monition was kept in the letter, but evaded in the spirit. The candles were not placed on the table, but on 'a narrow movable ledge of wood resting on the table.' The cup and the wafer were elevated, but not 'over the head.' At a part of the consecration prayer the Incumbent bent 'one knee,' and in so doing he confessed that his 'knee might momentarily have touched the ground.' Notwithstanding the praiseworthy ingenuity of these devices, he was condemned by the Privy Council, their lordships assuring him that 'a mere evasive compliance with the monition would not suffice.'

The Purchas case, like the St. Alban's, does not directly touch doctrine. It is only concerned with the legality of practices and dresses which, however, are confessed on both sides to be connected with doctrine. The charges against Mr. Purchas were, mixing water with the wine in the Communion, standing with his back to the people while reading the prayer of consecration, using wafer-bread, and wearing, or causing to be worn, sundry vestments utterly unknown in the service of the Church of England.

There was also a charge of setting up holy water for the use of the congregation ; but this was not proved. The really difficult part in this case was what concerned the vestments. It is strange that though the black gown has been in use from time immemorial it is nowhere prescribed,* and yet there is a rubric which at first sight seems to prescribe vestments which, from the Reformation, till the days of Mr. Purchas and his friends, nobody ever saw in the Church of England. This rubric is that ‘such ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministrations, shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI.’ The Prayer-book used in that year describes these ‘ornaments’ as ‘a white albe, plain, with a vestment and cope,’ to be worn by the priest in the administration of the Communion ; and when there were other priests or deacons to assist, these were to wear ‘the vestures appointed for their ministry, that is to say, albes with tunicles.’ In the reign of Edward, the Prayer-book was revised (1552), when it was ordered that the minister was to wear ‘neither albe, vestment nor cope,’ but ‘a surplice only.’ In the Prayer-book of Elizabeth (1559) it was provided that ‘the minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times of his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the Church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI.’ This Prayer-book, however, contained an Act of Parliament

* This is evidently because it existed before any of the present prescriptions.

known as Queen Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, which provided that these ornaments were to be retained 'until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of Her Commissioners.' During the reign of Elizabeth, as a simple matter of history, all these vestments disappeared, while her 'advertisement' requires that in all prayers, rites of the Church, as well as in the Communion, the minister shall 'wear a comely surplice with sleeves.' At the Hampton Court Conference the Puritans objected to the surplice only, which is an argument that no other vestment was in use, except, of course, the gown to which they did not object. The Prayer-book was revised in 1604, and the ornaments-rubric retained: but the canons published at the same time provided that, in cathedrals and collegiate churches, the principal minister should wear 'a decent cope' in the administration of the Communion; but in other churches, on all occasions, whether sacrament or prayers, the minister was to wear 'a decent and comely surplice with sleeves.' At the Savoy Conference (1662) the Puritans objected to the ornaments-rubric as it stood in the old Prayer-books of Elizabeth and James. The rubric was then inserted as we now have it, which follows for the most part the words of Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity. In this rubric the ornaments of the ministers, whatever they may be, are not confined to the Communion, but are to be used 'at all times of their ministration.' They are to be 'retained,' which the judges say could not refer to some ornaments to be restored, but must have referred to those that had never been out of use.

These were the cope and the surplice. The judges, therefore, decided that these are the only legal vestments in the service of the Church. The time of preaching is, of course, excepted. In no case is preaching ever included as a ministration. The dress in the pulpit was a point on which discussion was never raised. The original question was concerning the vestments in the Communion, and the decision was that only the surplice is to be worn. The usual form of expression is—in the prayers, Communion, and ‘rites,’ which are the measure of what is meant by ‘ministration.’

The interpretation of the rubric which the judges have made is really the only one that, by a fair investigation of the whole case, they could have made. They confessed that their task was difficult, and though we approve of their judgment, we think there is still something about this rubric which is unexplained. We all know why Elizabeth wished the restoration of the ornaments that had been laid aside in the time of Edward, and we also know why her archbishops and bishops were strongly opposed to them. By the time of James, as we have seen, they had ceased to exist, and though the rubric was retained, the canon specially regulating the dresses of the clergy gave it a definite meaning. Moreover, the changes made in the Prayer-book at this time were not properly changes. Those who made them expressly called them ‘explanations.’ But after the Puritans in 1662 had called attention to the danger of the rubric, and after the commissioners had been at the trouble to recast it, it is strange that any reference should have been made to any ornaments

of the time of Edward VI. It is, of course, possible that the revisionists of 1662 had forgotten all that the rubric originally meant. They evidently supposed that the Puritans were aiming only at the surplice, and so determined that the rubric should 'continue as it was.' And yet they did not suffer it to continue as it was, but in that spirit of passion, prejudice, and love of opposition which, alas! too clearly characterized other changes of this date, the rubric was made, if possible, more objectionable to the Puritans than it was before. This seems to be the whole secret of the history of this rubric. There is no evidence whatever that the revisionists who recast it ever contemplated the restoration of the pre-Reformation vestments.

Mr. Purchas's other offences had not even the plea of an ambiguous rubric. Two indeed were dismissed for want of evidence. He carried a biretta in his hand, but it was not shown that he had put the fools' cap on his head. There was 'holy water' in the Church for the use of the 'faithful;' but it was not proved that it had received consecration at the hands of Mr. Purchas. The judge in the Court of Arches had decided that Mr. Purchas could not lawfully mix water with the Communion wine at the time of the service, but that he might do it by stealth in the vestry, or in his own house. The judges in the Privy Council, however, decided that he must give the communicants undiluted wine. They also pointed out to him that the rubric is very plain against wafer bread. It says that 'the bread shall be such as is usual to be eaten.' On the last and all-important question of how the

'priest' should stand when he performs the awful act of consecration the judges had again to exercise their capacity for historical inquiry. Before the days of Ritualism, it was always supposed that the north meant the north, and so the minister stood as directed in the rubric, at the north side of the Communion-table. But Mr. Purchas and his friends were capable of a new idea. They said that a Communion-table had not four sides, but two sides and two ends, and as the table stood with one end towards the north and another towards the south, there was consequently no north side. And so they determined that the 'priest' was to stand on the northern part of the west side with his back to the people. But the rubric says that he is to break the bread 'before the people,' which does not seem possible if the people are to be behind him, and his back turned upon them. The rubric involves the dilemma that either the north side must mean the north end, or 'before the people' must mean with the priest's back to the people. But this was not the fault of the rubric-maker. The whole difficulty is cleared up by history. At the Reformation, when the old stone altars were removed to signify the abolition of the sacrifice of the mass, tables made of wood were put in their places. These were to stand 'in the body of the Church or chancel.' As a matter of fact, in the time of the Communion they commonly stood with the two ends east and west and the two sides north and south. There was then a proper north side, where the minister standing could break the bread 'before the people.' But when Laud wished to reconvert the ministers into 'priests' and the wooden

tables into altars, he ordered the tables to stand 'altar-wise,' as they now stand, with the sides east and west and the ends north and south. He was resisted by Bishop Williams and many of the bishops and clergy of his day; but the tables are now nearly all turned as he wished them, and hence the impossibility of properly keeping a rubric which did not contemplate the tables standing as they now stand. The judges, after making themselves acquainted with this, had no alternative but to determine that the only way to keep the rubric was to stand at the north end of the table.

The case of Mr. Bennet is at present before the Privy Council. The Dean of Arches has already acquitted him, but only on the ground of a retraction in the way of correcting the words in the first edition of his pamphlet. At the Reformation special care was taken to exclude from our formularies the doctrine of transubstantiation. Words more express than the Articles contain could not be devised, and facts more certain do not exist than that our Reformers died at the stake rather than believe this doctrine. It is true that it can be modified. Because of our ignorance of what substance is, there may be a question as to what is changed. If the substratum of matter, as some metaphysicians have supposed, be merely spirit, then the presence of Christ's body may be only the presence of a spirit. This explanation may be found in some Roman Catholic writers; but it is not that of Trent. It was not that of the Roman Catholic theologians in the time of Mary; it was not even that of our Reformers. This uncertainty of what substance is did not occur to them, certainly not as an

explanation of transubstantiation. Mr. Bennet did not scruple to write that we have the 'visible presence of our Lord upon the altars of our churches.' The Dean of Arches said he 'read these words with much surprise and sorrow.' He said also, as he well might, that Mr. Bennet's language was 'lamentably loose and inaccurate;' but as the words were withdrawn, he gave Mr. Bennet the benefit of a doubt that they may have meant more than he intended.

The acquittal was, however, expressly grounded on the conclusion that our formularies teach an 'objective, actual, and real presence,' external to the communicant. This judgment the judges in the Privy Council cannot fail to reverse if they go into the subject as thoroughly as they have done in the *Purchas* case.* The Dean of Arches went through a multitude of arguments and materials as the ground of his judgment, but they were all borrowed at second-hand from Pusey, Hook, and some other writers of the same school, whose authority is the authority of moonshine. There are some theories which have come to be generally received in the Church of England just because of the persistency with which they have been repeated by interested parties. One of these is the believe on which the Dean of Arches seemed chiefly to rest, that Ridley believed in the real, that is the 'objective,' presence, and succeeded in instilling his view into Cranmer. There is no authority whatever for the supposition that Ridley believed in any 'objective' presence, and there is even less for the theory that

* This judgment has been reversed, but Mr. Bennet has been acquitted, on account of the ambiguity of his language.—X.

he in any way caused Cranmer to change his views. Cranmer and Ridley both persisted in using the rhetoric of the Fathers concerning Christ's presence in the sacrament. But they both added that they meant only a sacramental presence, and this they distinctly explained as a mere figure, meaning that the bread was called Christ's body because it represented Christ's body. The examiners at Oxford took the extravagant language of the Fathers literally, and when they found that Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer did not also take it literally, they condemned them as heretics. Ridley on his trial, made efforts to reconcile his views with the language of the Fathers, but the explanations were so violent that all the Catholics hissed him.*

The Dean of Arches was misled by another theory, which is a pure invention of some of Mr. Bennet's friends. This is that our formularies were so framed as to 'exclude the Zwinglian idea of a bare commemoration.' The truth is, that Zwingle never did teach any such doctrine of bare commemoration as is generally ascribed to him. Moreover, whatever Zwingle's doctrine was, our Reformers embraced it in express words. Nor is it a difficult question to know what Zwingle's doctrine was in its main idea. Cranmer said that Zwingle did not differ from Œcolampadius, that Œcolampadius did not differ from Bucer, and that he himself did not differ from any of them. They

* A remarkable case is the strange language of Augustine on Psalm xxxiv. (Vul. xxxiii.), which is supposed to refer to David at Gath; an old version of 1 Sam. xxi. 13, reads, 'He carried himself in his own hands.' This was not true, Augustine says, of David, but it was true of Christ, for when He instituted the sacrament 'He carried His body in His own hands.' Ridley explained Augustine as meaning the sacramental body, so that *in a sense* Christ carried His body in His own hands.

all taught a real presence, but only to the worthy recipient. Christ was present to the faith of the believer. Hooker and Waterland, two of the best authorities on such a subject, both declare expressly that this is the true doctrine of the formularies of the Church of England. A real presence in this sense has always been admitted, and any extravagant or rhetorical language that may have been retained in our formularies, has been retained with the understanding that it is to be interpreted only in this sense. The 'real presence' of the Church of England is the presence which every Christian recognises in every act either of true faith or true worship.

For all these judgments the Church of England has cause for devout thankfulness. It is now proved that there is a difference between license and lawlessness. The law of progress is not impeded, but it has been made to appear that there are conditions which must be obeyed. We have not to deal with mere abstract questions, but also with circumstances which we inherited and did not make. It is not allowed us to break away by a violent effort from the past. There may be occasionally prophetic teachers with new truth, or with what they suppose to be new truth, severed by a wide interval from all that we have hitherto believed. But the course of the world is that these teachers be martyrs for what they have to teach. In Mr. Voysey's case the judges wisely decided that though great license might be granted in the interpretation of the Articles, yet an entire departure from them could not be allowed. Those who see further than their contemporaries, or who think they see fur-

ther, have their choice either to break with the Church collective, or to wait till the light is more generally diffused. There are periods in the history of progress when violent conflicts are inevitable. There may be circumstances that bring about a separation, as when the old prophets were stoned, or when the disciples of Jesus were thrust out of the synagogues. But there are other times when those who see beyond the present can quietly wait without pouring contempt and scorn on the beliefs of those who do not yet see as they do. 'If,' Mr. Brooke says, 'one believes in the progress of revelation, one must also hold that truth must be continually reclothing itself.' He that has such a belief—

'Places his useless form upon the shelf, as he binds and lays by a book which he has loved and drained dry, for it forms part of the history of his own growth, and is part of the history of the world's religious growth. I cannot endure the abuse which is lavished by some on bygone religious systems, nor the virulence with which some turn upon their early beliefs; it is the feeling of the mob and not of cultivated men.'

There is a reverence due to old beliefs, and to those who still retain them. This is a reverence which has been yielded by all really wise reformers, except when their reforms have been like the 'crackling of thorns beneath the pot.' They have remembered the advice of Lessing :—'Thou abler spirit who art fretting and restless over the last page of the primer, beware! Beware of letting thy weaker fellow-scholar mark what thou perceivest afar off, or what thou art beginning to see!'

The result of these judgments is to determine what are the legal doctrines and practices of the Church.

It is well to know this, as a point from which to start. It does not follow that these doctrines are true, or that the ritual may not be changed. But it is something to know our true position. That we have all departed from the theology of the Articles of Religion, should not be concealed. Nor is it necessary, for this is done by express permission of the law. But this should not lead us to ignore the truth concerning the Articles themselves. We are not bound to take them as they were meant by those who wrote them, but we are bound to know honestly what was their first original and natural meaning. To make them mean what they were never intended to mean is a greater sin than the sin of heresy itself. When we have seen fairly what is their proper meaning, we can determine for ourselves how far we have departed from them, and how far we are justified in using the license which is allowed by the law of subscription. When a clergyman ceases to believe them as thoroughly as Mr. Voysey appears to have done, and feels like him called in the spirit of a prophet to denounce the theology which they teach, it is time for the law to speak.

We admit, and the judges seemed to admit, that the line cannot be drawn with absolute justice. With the persons concerned, it is a matter of conscience; with the Church it is a matter of duty for self-preservation; and with the judges it is a matter of determining what the doctrine or ritual of the Church is, and how far the law can give license. Mr. Voysey was condemned because he rejected the authority of books in the Bible, and denied doctrines, not on 'critical grounds,' but according to his own 'private

taste and judgment.' But the same thing might be said in some sense of every heretic, whatever his learning or his discernment. What are critical grounds to one are not critical grounds to another. The judges here plainly recognised a kind of consciousness in the community of the Church, as represented by the learning of the general body of the clergy. This is a vague rule, but sufficient for general use. When Mr. Voysey was citing passages from other heretics of the Church, Sir R. Phillimore rightly said that all these men should be prosecuted too. Their heresies did not help Mr. Voysey, who was on his trial. They had never been prosecuted, and if they had been, the law might have condemned them. It might, however, also have embraced them without being capable of extending comprehension to Mr. Voysey. The result of the judgments as to doctrine plainly is, that the teaching of the formularies is to be the basis, that a wide margin will be left for freedom, and that the limits of this freedom will be fixed by a kind of common spirit of the Church.

In regard to ritual, the law allows considerably less latitude than in respect of doctrine. The same judgment which has come on Mr. Purchas may come on every other offender who has sinned after the similitude of his transgression. While unprosecuted, a clergyman may exercise liberty in ritual, and depart from the law of the Church, but if he provokes prosecution, his condemnation is sure.* It may seem

* The Bishop of Ely has recently given an instance of forbearance which, though, on the whole, both generous and prudent, is yet not what we should

unfair to the High Church party that they are not to have the liberty in ritual which is given to the other parties in doctrine. It is now understood by all that ritual represents doctrine, that the vestments and posture bespeak a certain belief. The prohibition of them is, therefore, a denial that their doctrine is that of the Church of England. The inequality of freedom is not, however, so great as it appears at first sight. High Churchmen are still at liberty by the license of law to hold their views of the Eucharist. They are only forbidden to be too obtrusive, to disturb the peace of parishes, or by extravagance to provoke a prosecution. It is not to be regretted that this judgment sweeps far beyond mere ritualism. It justly embraces the whole High Church party whose innovations in the Reformed Church of England are

have recommended. The Vicar of St. Ives had introduced some novelties, and persisted in some of the practices condemned in the recent judgments. The parish churchwarden, Mr. Read Adams, presented the vicar at the bishop's visitation, and afterwards called upon the bishop to take action in the case. His lordship declined. The churchwarden again wrote to the bishop, enclosing the following quotation from a letter by the Archbishop of Canterbury: 'Can a bishop's authority stand still while the affections of the people are being alienated by practices intended to undo all the benefits which the Reformation has conferred upon this country? If the bishop is called upon by a proper authority, it is evident that he must act, and it may be that he may find it necessary to act of his own accord. In judging what is lawful in the Church, he must remember that he is a bishop of the Church of England and not that of Rome.' The Bishop of Ely answered that he had resolved not to prosecute any of his clergy for small deflections from the rubric, and he was sure that the same course would be adopted by the archbishop. It cannot fairly be expected that the bishops should be involved in the expense of a legal prosecution, yet it is due to the people that they admonish offending vicars, and warn them of their danger in departing from the laws of the Church. If the last vestige of a bishop's authority is not entirely gone, he ought to be able to compel his clergy to a strict observance of the rubrics, when any parishioner, much more a parish churchwarden, complains of their violation. This could be no hardship to the High Churchmen if the same conformity were exacted from every clergyman of whatever party when novelties were introduced into the service that alienated or divided the parishioners.

distinctly traceable in history. It has been a custom with this party from its earliest beginnings, which were towards the end of the reign of James I., to maintain that it represented the true Church of England. Its first movement was to deny the Calvinism of the Articles of Religion, and to invent a theory unknown to the Reformers, that they were articles of peace intended to comprehend both parties. It then, as we have already seen, put the communion-tables out of their place, and on this followed, for the most part in our own day, the position of the clergyman out of his place also. But the law has met the transgressor, and determined that the High Church party, with its doctrines and customs, has never been more than a party tolerated in the Church.

We have to be thankful for these judgments, because they determine that we shall not go back to the theology of Rome, which has been already rejected, and because they leave room for progress under normal conditions. A relaxed subscription to the Articles, but still a subscription, combines a basis with freedom. Doubtless were the Articles to be written again, they would take another shape; but this is scarcely to be expected. The alternatives are either to subscribe them or to set them aside. The latter, in some respects, would be the better if it were really practicable; but this is doubtful. To subscribe them is not so great a hardship as to some men it appears. They embody substantially the doctrine which we still believe; but under forms which the enlightened Christian consciousness has outgrown. It has often been proposed to reduce subscription

simply to the Canonical Scriptures; but here we encounter the same difficulties. The senses in which the Scriptures are believed are as varied as the senses put on the Articles of Religion. The canon itself has to be settled, besides the genuineness, authenticity, authority, and inspiration of the different books. It is indeed an anomaly to subscribe to doctrines as if they were settled, and yet claim the freedom to regard them as open questions; but it is an anomaly from which at present there is no escape.

Last of all, but not least, we have cause to be thankful for the judgments that they furnish a basis for the union and comprehension of all Christians within fixed yet wide boundaries. The judgments in the cases of the Ritualists declare distinctly with legal and historical evidence that sacerdotalism is simply tolerated in the Church of England, but that its vagaries and eccentricities are not to be endured. It is a great matter to have it distinctly proclaimed that the pretensions of a priesthood have no true home in the Church of England. We have borne with them hitherto because we knew that they had no real foundation, and were sometimes to be overlooked because of the sincerity of those who held them. Their only alarming feature was their claim to be essentially of the Church of England; but this is now removed. The sacerdotal principle is incompatible with progress. It represents a view of revelation different from that which we must now embrace, and in which rests our only hope of an enlightened conception of Christianity, and a proper understanding between differing communities of Christian men.

Sacerdotalism must ever be in sharp opposition to all which differs from it. In accordance with this, it now claims independence of the State, and refuses obedience to the law. It wishes to be a law to itself, on the ground of its supposed Divine appointment to be the channel of truth to the world. This claim is consistently made only by the Roman Catholic, who holds with it belief in an infallible Church. But the Church of England as interpreted by the law of England is found to rest on another basis. It acknowledges no priesthood and no infallibility; but submits to the same law of progress which rules alike the Church and the world.

XII.

FRENCH PROTESTANTISM.

A FEW weeks ago, one May morning, a multitude of well-dressed and apparently well-to-do people were coming out of an obscure chapel in Essex Street. The little street was lined with carriages, and busy men passing through the Strand turned hastily aside to ask what was the matter. Is it a marriage? Is it a theatre? were the most frequent questions. Those who knew answered that M. Coquerel, the French orator, had been preaching. The eloquent Huguenot preaching the anniversary sermon for the English Unitarians was a subject of study for all students of religious development. The special chapel in which the sermon was preached had been built by the exertions of a clergyman who seceded from the Church of England in the end of the last century, but most of the people present were lineally descended from the old Puritans. The representatives of Calvin's French and English disciples had met after the lapse

* Contemporary Review, September, 1872.

of three centuries, but so far are they from the theology of Calvin, that in the common judgment of all Christian men they are barely on the borderland of Christianity.

When a man wants a theory to explain developments of this kind, he has not far to go. Something in Calvin's Church or in Calvin's theology will be made to bear the burden. Half a century ago there was a great controversy between some English divines as to the causes of German Rationalism. One party traced its origin entirely to the want of a hierarchical episcopacy. The Lutherans, as well as the Calvinists, had set aside the constitution which Christ and His Apostles gave to the Church; and the result was, a departure from the true faith. The apostacy, however, was not general, and therefore the theory was not of universal application. The Presbyterians in Scotland, the Independents in England, and the majority of the French Reformed still adhered to the theology of the Reformation. On the other hand, during the last fifty years, we have had a sturdy crop of Rationalism in the Church of England, and the Bishops have had no power against it. The Church of Rome, too, has had its Rationalism, and we have yet to see if the hierarchy, after all the toils of the Vatican, will succeed in suppressing it. What is called Rationalism is a natural growth, not peculiar to any Church or sect. The arguments by which one party fastens it as a reproach on another remind us of a story of Dr. Robertson, the celebrated Scotch divine and historian. He had come to England with Henry Dundas, Baron Cockburn, and Robert Sinclair. The

three last, seeing a gallows on a hillock, rode round it to get a nearer view of the felon. When they met at their inn, Dr. Robertson began a discourse on the character of nations, especially descanting on the barbarity of the English. He had seen three Englishmen on horseback doing what no Scotchman would ever have done. 'Doctor,' said Dundas, with the face of a criminal, 'it was Cockburn and Sinclair and me.' This spoiled the theory of the development of the character of nations. Philosophies of the history of religion are like philosophies of history in general, made on very uncertain knowledge. The causes which affect religious belief are mostly from their very nature, unknown. A great work has yet to be done in the mere study of phenomena before a conclusion of any real value can be reached.

There are few pages of ecclesiastical history so full of interest and instruction as those which concern the Reformed Church of France. When we look at the frivolous and volatile creature who is the typical Frenchman of the present day, we can scarcely believe that Calvin and Beza were Frenchmen, and that their countrymen formed the Church of the Huguenots. But three centuries ago the Reformed Church of France promised to be the most powerful of those which embraced the Reformation. Whole towns declared themselves Protestants. Worshippers to the number of 20,000 or 30,000 used to assemble in one place. Princes and nobles were among its members. The first Synod of Rochelle was attended by the Queen of Navarre, the Prince of Navarre, the Prince

of Condé, the Prince of Nassau, Admiral Coligny, and many 'other Lords and Gentlemen.' Its persecutions have been the saddest in all history, yet it exists. The bush has burned, but has not been consumed. It survived the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the defection of Henry of Navarre, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the proscription which followed for many generations. Dynasties have passed away, empires have risen and fallen, revolution has succeeded revolution, and still the Church of the Huguenots exists. It meets in our day under the protection of the Republic, and holds the first Synod which it has been allowed to hold for two hundred years. 'In my country,' said M. Coquerel, in his eloquent sermon in Essex Street, 'there was a time when a powerful king declared that Protestant Christianity should be destroyed in his realm, and then all our temples were cut down even to the ground; but the worship there offered was alive, and survived the temple, and there is a tradition in the mountains of the Cevennes, that when the Huguenots, after their temples had been destroyed, came by night to the ruins, and listened, they heard angels singing in the clouds the old cherished psalms which they had no right then to sing any more. They listened to them, and they went away comforted, hoping that their temples would rise again some day; and so they have, and at the present time from those temples which had been brutally overthrown, rise up in all parts of France our own psalms, and we do not want to hear voices in heaven singing them, for we sing them with all our heart, and all our faith, and all our mind,

because we have believed, and our belief could not be destroyed with our temple.'*

M. Thiers, at the solicitation, it is believed, of M. Guizot, granted to the Reformed Church permission to hold a National Synod. The value of this measure is differently estimated by different parties. Ecclesiastical assemblies may be useful for conference, deliberation, or administration of business. They may be mischievous, like the Councils of Nice and Trent, or they may be harmless, like the Pan-Anglican, which gave amusement to a multitude of profane people, and immortality to an Archbishop of Canterbury. In matters indifferent, where the minority is willing to submit to the decisions of the majority, general synods may be useful. But when this is not the case, there is an insoluble question of the power of majorities and the rights of minorities.

The French nation, humbled by recent disasters, and taught, it is to be hoped, a salutary lesson, has wisely set itself to regulate its internal affairs. M. Thiers is administering the Republic on principles of liberty and equity hitherto unknown in the government of France. The last Synod met at Loudon, in the days of Louis XIV. When it was dissolved the royal commissioners told the members that they would meet again when the king thought proper to assemble them. To-day the Synod meets, as Pastor Babut said in his sermon at the Oratory, 'sous la protection de la République française, qui s'est montrée aussi jalouse de protéger nos institutions religieuses que

* The subject of the sermon was the death of Stephen and the destruction of the Temple worship.

Louis XIV. de les détruire.' The first *séance* was on the 6th of June. The place of meeting was the Church of the Holy Spirit. Conspicuous on a chair was an open Bible, under a canopy of velvet. Behind it was a platform for the president and secretaries, and before it the tribune for the speakers. The arrangement was in imitation of the National Assembly at Versailles, and the members were grouped as in the Chamber of Deputies. On the left were the Liberals, their leaders, MM. Athanase and Etienne Coquerel, Pécaut, Colani, Fontanés, and Steeg, in the front rank. On the right the Orthodox, with the venerable Guizot at their head. On the centre left the best known were MM. Jalabert and Montaudon; and on the centre right MM. Babut, Bois, Dhombres, and Breyton.*

The constitution of an ecclesiastical synod as a government within the State is a subject that would perplex the keenest lawyers, if they were called upon to determine it. Where a Church is a conventional or free community, it may be supposed to exercise discipline with the utmost freedom. It may have a power to make decrees so long as the members are willing to obey its decrees, but any effort to enforce obedience would probably bring it in collision with the civil power. A Church connected with the State may, like the Church of Scotland, have an apparent or even an actual autonomy, and yet this freedom may depend on the mere will or indifference of the

* Jalabert is a layman. The others are pastors, excepting, of course, M. Guizot. Colani, however, has resigned position as pastor, and wishes to be considered a layman.

State. In England, where the State and the Church are so blended as to be in some respects the same community, the constitution of an ecclesiastical synod is more perplexing. When Convocation was restored in the reign of Queen Anne, during the few years of its fevered existence it did little else than set forth enormous claims concerning its rights and its duties. The Lower House maintained that it was independent, that it had its own prolocutor, and was not subject to the president of the Upper House. In the great controversy which arose about the powers of Convocation, some maintained that it was one of the estates of the realm, and that its decisions had the same validity as Acts of Parliament. This view of Convocation, advocated by Dr. Atterbury, was controverted by Dr. Wake. Convocation found its actual power to be very small. The Lower House condemned Bishop Burnet and John Toland. It afterwards arraigned William Whiston and Samuel Clarke. It was proceeding to condemn Bishop Hoadly's luminous exposition of the principles of the kingdom of Christ, in which the Upper House would probably have joined, when George I., in his great clemency, sent the idle talkers to their parishes, and prevented them doing mischief to themselves and other people.

By an unaccountable law, ecclesiastical synods, left to themselves, are always conservative. They defend all received errors, and have a natural antipathy to reforms. When Tillotson persuaded King William to allow Convocation to meet, that they might sanction such a revision in the Prayer-Book as would conciliate the Nonconformists, he soon found that he had

taken the surest way to defeat himself. It must have been after this experience that he said he never knew any good come out of such assemblies. Since Tillotson's day, all liberal theologians have had an instinctive dread of ecclesiastical synods. In England, Convocation is regarded as a conference chiefly of Church dignitaries, without power to do anything, but with the will to obey a being of whom it is said that he

‘finds some mischief still,
For idle hands to do.’

The proceedings of the old Huguenot synods do not seem to have been much more edifying than those of the English Convocation. At that of Poitiers, in 1561, canons were made against dancing, and professors of dancing were to be excommunicated if they did not quit their profession. At the Synod of Rochelle, in 1571, the ‘abominable errors and heresies’ of the Socinians were condemned, and a committee was appointed to desire the English bishops to repress the errors of Richard Cosin, and ‘other errors which had begun to be in vogue among them.’ In the following year, at the Synod of Nîmes, all kinds of theatricals were forbidden, whether public or private. It was also decreed that professors of divinity might retain their adulterous wives, which privilege was not granted to pastors, on the ground that they were to be exemplary in their families as well as in their persons. At St. Foy, in 1578, the ministers were instructed not to recite profane authors or stories in their sermons, but to let the Scripture have full and sovereign authority. One minister was deposed as

‘ a common rogue,’ who had intruded himself into the ministry by means of forged letters, and who had been punished by a magistrate for clipping his Majesty’s coin and selling it to the goldsmiths. Nevertheless, added the decree of the Synod, ‘ We do license him to keep school and instruct youth!’ At the same Synod a canon was made concerning ‘ the immodest habits and fashions of men and women,’ and both sexes were enjoined ‘ to keep modesty in their hair.’ In accordance with this canon, the pastor of Montauban refused the communion to the wife and daughter of Du Plessis because they refused to have their hair cut. Lord Bacon was then at Montauban, and suspecting that Madame Du Plessis had a design upon him with her daughter’s long hair, he took the side of the pastor who censured the ‘ scandalous excess in head-attire.’

The liberal theologians of the French Reformed Church showed an early dread of the National Synod. Letters and petitions were sent to M. Thiers from the liberal pastors and liberal consistories, setting forth that the gift of the Republic would only be used as an arm of oppression, to divide the Church, and to hinder freedom of inquiry. The President answered that he would treat them all with equity. If they remained one Church, they would be acknowledged as such by the Republic. If they divided, they would both be acknowledged. The Minister of Worship explained that it was impossible for the government to take cognisance of the questions on which Protestants were not agreed. His office was that of sentinel of the law.

Evangelicals and Liberals met in the Synod with very different feelings, the one hailing it as the restoration of the ancient heritage of the Church, and the other dreading it as a machinery that would interfere with the necessities of the present hour. These different feelings are quite in agreement with the different positions of the two parties. The one supposes a complete revelation of truth made once for all, and that this revelation is expressed definitely in the dogmatic standards of the Church. With this view, the duty of a Protestant synod is to revise and enforce the dogmas of the Reformers. The Liberals, on the other hand, not believing that revelation consists in definite dogmas, much less that the formulated dogmas of the confessions are a revelation, were afraid of the interference of a synod in matters of faith. The first subject of discussion was naturally concerning the constitution of the assembly. M. Guizot proposed a vote of thanks to the Republic and to M. Thiers for restoring to the Church its right of self-government. M. Jalabert was not sure if this was a gift to be received with gratitude. M. Pécaut wished so to express their thanks as not to imply that the minority were to be bound by the decisions of the majority. M. Colani maintained that the Church could not be said to have self-government so long as it was not properly represented by the Synod. The form of thanks was left to a committee. On the third day there was some discussion as to the persons to be admitted to the assembly. M. Guizot opposed the admission of ladies, arguing that their presence would lessen the solemnity of the discussions. M. Colani

vindicated their admission, on the ground that they were more religious than men. The Synod decreed that they should be admitted. On the 10th of June the discussion about the constitution of the assembly began in earnest. M. Jalabert explained that it was not the wish of the Left that the Synod should be dissolved. He hoped rather that the two parties would work together, and preserve the unity of the Church. The decree of the Republic cited the laws of the year X. and of 1852, and added a third Article, which constituted particular synods electoral colleges. By this arrangement, consistories with six or seven thousand members had the same number of representatives as consistories with thirty thousand. This fault in the decree need not, the speaker said, prevent fraternal discussion; but the Synod could not have any other character than that of an assembly which the government might consult as to the welfare of the Church.

M. Laurens,* on the other side, maintained the authoritative character of the Synod. We are not here, he said, for a new work. We do not inaugurate for the Reformed Church of France a new government. We are but the continuators of a work of restoration begun under the first Republic in the year X., continued under the second Republic in 1852, and which now we are called to complete in 1872. Our Church, the speaker said, has a past history which shows it to have been in constant possession of its confession of faith, its discipline, its liturgy, and its hierarchical organization. When the Church was

* A layman.

united to the State in the year X., the first Consul, in the preface to the decree, recognised the discipline of the Church. M. Laurens cited also the words of the Count de Belbeuf in 1869 in the case of the Consistory of Caen :—‘ La loi de l’an X., traité d’alliance entre l’Etat et le Protestantisme, n’a donc pu ni voulu innover. Elle a reconnu l’Eglise réformée comme communion chrétienne, avec ses conditions d’établissement préexistantes, avec les principes et les règles de son ancien gouvernement.’ After explaining the whole government of the Church, the Count ended by saying :—‘ Le Synode national représente en effet dans sa plus haute expression l’autorité religieuse, dogmatique et disciplinaire.’ M. Jalabert disputed this authority, and M. Guizot supported it. M. Laurens further maintained that the President of the Republic intended to give Church authority in matters of faith and discipline independent of the State. M. Larnac answered that this independence was an illusion. He would not enter into the question of the rights of the ancient synods, but since that time the Church had become united to the State, and while that union remained; absolute, ecclesiastical independence was impossible.

Two propositions were subsequently laid before the Synod—one by M. Jalabert, representing the Left, and another by M. Pernessin,* representing the Right. The first was this :—

‘ L’Assemblée, appelée à se prononcer sur son caractère et sur ses attributions, reconnaît que les bases électorales adoptées pour sa convocation ne peuvent donner la certitude que toutes les ten-

* A layman.

dances du protestantisme français soient représentées dans son sens en raison de leur importance relative. Mais sous cette réserve, elle se considère dans ses différentes fractions comme étant auprès du gouvernement l'organe autorisé des besoins, des vœux et des sentiments des différentes parties de l'Eglise ;—et comme appelée, à l'égard des communautés protestantes, à faire une œuvre d'union et de pacification sous les inspirations de Jésus Christ, chef de l'Eglise invisible, dans la communion duquel elle veut travailler à l'avancement du règne de Dieu en toute vérité et charité.'

The second ran thus :—

'L'Assemblée, considérant que le présent Synode général a été convoqué, et s'est réuni aux termes des lois et décrets qui ont réglé le régime de l'Eglise réformée de France depuis son rétablissement ; considérant que la convocation et l'élection au dit Synode général reconnaissent et consacrent les libertés et l'autonomie de l'Eglise réformée de France en matière religieuse ; considérant que les élections au présent Synode général ont été faites en pleine liberté, avec le concours de toutes les autorités religieuses appelées à y prendre part, et que le droit de l'Eglise réformée de France à modifier, s'il y a lieu, son régime intérieur religieux, notamment son système électoral, quant à ses Synodes futurs, reste entière et pleinement réservé, passe à l'ordre du jour.'

The discussion seemed nearly exhausted, when M. de Clausonne * gave it for a moment a new character. He thought it difficult to pass the order of M. Pernessin. The arguments by which it had been maintained that the Church always had the right of synods in possession were ingenious, but not supported by history. For seventy years the government of the Churches had been congregational. Their reunion and whatever authority the Synod had were due to the sovereign generosity of M. Thiers. The speaker also objected to the motion of M. Jalabert, that it seemed to blame the Government for giving them permission to meet as a National Synod. He recom-

* A layman.

mended both parties to accept the Synod as a boon, to use it for the good of the Church, and to maintain union by mutual concessions.

The Left asked a moment for deliberation, and substituted this motion:—‘L’Assemblée, prenant acte des réserves faites par un certain nombre de ses membres sur le caractère et les attributions du Synode, passe à l’ordre du jour.’ It was maintained by the Right that this would invalidate beforehand the proceedings of the Synod. M. Jalabert’s proposition being withdrawn, that of M. Pernessin came first, which was put to the vote and carried by a majority of sixty-one against forty-six.

The Liberals thus far were defeated. The Synod claimed what the English Convocation once claimed, to be a legislative body, exercising ecclesiastical authority co-ordinately with the State. It regarded itself, and so far as the President of the Republic is concerned, apparently with justice, as having received power to govern the Church. A limit, however, was added, that in case of a division, the Liberals would receive the same treatment as the Evangelicals. This equitable arrangement had the effect of reducing the practical question to the simple one of the expediency of a separation or of the two parties remaining in the same Church. As Congregationalists, it was not necessary that their differences should separate them, but as Presbyterians the minority might be compelled to submit to the decisions of the majority. The Liberals seem to have made it their chief business to prevent a schism, and the Evangelicals made it theirs to proclaim what they regarded as truth.

At this point the discussions of the Synod have a universal interest. They touch on the great practical Church question of the day—how men of different religious sentiments are to work together in the same Church. We are trying to settle it in the Church of England, where we have three parties with widely different conceptions of the meaning of Christianity. We meet each other as friends, and at times take part in the same services, where the trial to some is quite as much as human flesh can bear. A ‘celebrant’ of the new school goes through some extraordinary performances before the sacramental bread and wine, while an Evangelical or Broad Church helper is, as the case may be, either indignant or amused. An Evangelical teaches one way of salvation, a High Churchman another, and a Broad Churchman has a different idea of salvation altogether. In the French Reformed Church, the sacramental party is missing, but this is not due to the want of extravagant sacramental language in the old standards of the Church. The subtle explanations of a *real* but *spiritual* presence of a *body* are plentiful in the old Calvinistic confessions. The Reformers, though ready to go to the stake rather than believe transubstantiation, like a great many religious people in the present day, talked mysterious nonsense about eating Christ’s flesh and drinking His blood in the Eucharist.*

A sacramental party, however, has not developed in the French Protestant Church. The main division

* We may instance the lines written by Dr. Doddridge, and sung in all churches—

“Hail, sacred feast which Jesus makes,
Rich banquet of His flesh and blood,”

is into Evangelicals and Liberals. The Evangelicals adhere in the main to the old creeds of the Church. Many of them are pietists that have been influenced religiously by the work of the Haldanes at Geneva, and by missionaries sent from England by the Wesleyans. Like all the zealous parties in England who come under the category of Evangelical, they regard their dogmatic creed as inseparable from their religious life. To be saved implies with them receiving certain views concerning a certain way of being saved. Their antagonism to the Liberals, who regard their dogmas as mere temporary theological concretions, is natural and intelligible. The more earnest of the Evangelicals wish to be separated from the Liberals. They do not want to be identified with men who in their judgment are not believers in Christianity. The Liberal sets aside the very beliefs which the Evangelical regards as the essence of the gospel. The only thing which he values is the religious life common to all good men. To promote this is his chief object, and his problem is how this religious life is to exist independent of what he regards as the untenable theologies.

In reading the discussions in the Synod, the first impression is the incapacity of the Evangelicals to understand the Liberals. This is due in some measure to the very nature of the positions held by the two parties. The Liberals do not formulate their beliefs. Like our English Unitarians, they are not so much a dogmatic as a zetetic sect. They want many subjects to be left open; how many they scarcely know. An important part of their religion is free

inquiry, but free inquiry is nothing positive, and must appear a very poor religion in the judgment of those who hold certain dogmas as unimpeachable and necessary certainties. M. Colani defined a Christian as one who feels a joyful trust in God. M. Clamagran,* another Liberal, described the Christian as for ever seeking truth, but never able to say, 'I have found it.' He does not wish formularies of faith, but the direct contact of the soul with the gospel and the person of Christ. The language of the Liberals sometimes wants explanation. They confess that their dogmatic belief is variable. They feel truth, and feel also that truth cannot be bound up in definitions. To use the words of our poet, they 'have but faith,' they do not 'know.'

This position is in the main intelligible, and therefore the incapacity of the Evangelicals to understand it is, to speak mildly, remarkable. Pastor Babut, in the opening sermon, divided Christians into three classes, whom he thus described: 'The Catholic Christian puts the authority of the Church and the Pope above Jesus Christ. The Rationalist Christian puts his reason or his conscience above Jesus Christ. The Evangelical Christian believes in Jesus Christ, because of Jesus Christ Himself, because of His testimony.' If by Rationalist Christians M. Babut means the Liberals, he could scarcely have made a more outrageous parody on their belief. Reason and conscience are not put above Jesus Christ, but they are recognised as the faculties by which alone we can believe in Jesus Christ. But for these faculties Jesus

* A layman.

Christ would be to us what any other man is, and His testimony no more than any other testimony. The argument might be turned against Pastor Babut. The Evangelical, it might be said, lays the foundation of his faith in histories, which he knows only by tradition, and in doctrinal speculations, which are metaphysical, and belong chiefly to the region of mere reasoning. The Liberals, on the contrary, make these indifferent, and go at once to the invincible facts of a new life and the power of spiritual contact with the gospel. The greatest offender of all in the way of misapprehending or misrepresenting the Liberals was M. Guizot. He spoke in general terms about unbelief, impiety, German theories, and Pantheism, which he called Materialism and Atheism. The Protestant sage might have learned by this time that there is nothing more provoking, more misleading, or more absolutely mischievous than this use of a multitude of vague words, which may be applied to anybody or anything. On the subject of Pantheism, has M. Guizot forgotten the words of the Abbé Maret: ‘Cependant les théories de M. Guizot, comme celles des Eclectiques, comme celles de M. Michelet et de M. Lerminier, nous paraissent aboutir à ce terme inévitable.’* It is not surprising that M. Coquerel rose and demanded who were meant by M. Guizot when he spoke of some in the Reformed Church that had violated the faith and overturned the foundations of Christianity. It was admitted that M. Coquerel was one of those intended, and yet the Synod decided that he should not be allowed a word in self-defence.

* *Essai sur le Panthéisme*, p. 48.

The object at which the Evangelicals aimed from the beginning of the Synod was to vote a creed which would declare the faith of the Church. They could not compel those who were already preachers to subscribe it, but they might impose it on future candidates. At first sight a creed seems one of the best ways of preserving the orthodox faith of a community. It is, however, a fact that Churches without creeds, as, for instance, the English Independents, may for the most part remain orthodox, while Churches with creeds, as the Church of England or the Lutheran Church in Germany, may find their creeds as straw and stubble before them. An Evangelical at the Synod was denouncing the Hegelians, and a Liberal answered that Hegel would have subscribed the most orthodox of the creeds. Any confession of faith will bear a great many meanings. The memorable feat of Dr. Newman with the Thirty-nine Articles has demonstrated that men cannot be bound by confessions of faith. Human language is necessarily imperfect, and forms of belief, like everything else in human nature, are continually undergoing an imperceptible change. A century had not elapsed in England before Arminians not only subscribed our Calvinistic articles, but even denied that they were Calvinistic. Professor Nicolas, in a recent lecture on the history of the College of Montauban, traced three different stages in the views of the professors. The first were strict Calvinists, even believing 'la damnation éternelle des petits enfants.' The last were more moderate, yet always clinging to Calvinism. The school of Saumur was the first to make a great departure from the confession of Rochelle.

The obstinately orthodox were at Sedan, while Montauban took a middle way between heresy and the old confession. M. Coquerel, in his speech at the Synod, traced the history of Liberalism through the past generations of the Reformed Church. 'Il y a toujours eu des libéraux dans l'Eglise. Vous citerai-je les noms de Rabaud Saint-Etienne, qui réorganisa l'Eglise réformée de Paris en 1787; de Jean Fabre, le forçat pour la foi, *l'honnête criminel*; des savants pasteurs Daillé et Blondel; d'Amyraut et de l'Ecole scientifique de Saumur; de l'illustre érudit Casaubon; du jurisconsulte Charles du Moulin, et enfin du plus éclairé des réformateurs, Zwingli? Ces hommes, dont nous sommes tous fiers, ont été les hétérodoxes de leur temps; les Synodes d'alors ne les ont pas exclus.' Orthodoxy, M. Coquerel went on to say, was something foreign to him. He had never renounced it because he had never received it. He was a Huguenot, proud of his descent. His fathers worshipped in the desert. Some of his more immediate ancestors were Liberal pastors. He might almost say that he was 'a Liberal before he was born.' For seventy years there had been no subscription to any confession. The preachers promised at their ordination that they would preach according to their conscience. Before this stage was reached, it is manifest that the creeds had ceased to serve the object for which they were written.

This history has some similitude with the history of creeds in England. The Presbyterians, driven out of the Established Church by the rigours of the Act of Uniformity, took a dislike to subscriptions altogether.

The State required them to subscribe thirty-three out of the Thirty-nine Articles, but beyond this they were free. When the Exeter controversy arose in 1719, and some of the ministers were charged with Arianism, the orthodox wished to renew subscription. The remedy has an odd history, but the lesson is the same—that creed or no creed, the beliefs of men will continue to change. One party subscribed the first of the Thirty-nine Articles, and the answer to the question on the Trinity in the Westminster Assembly's Catechism, while another party protested against being bound by any subscription. This was the fatal moment for Presbyterianism in England. A large number of the ministers and students who were against this new subscription conformed to the Established Church. Among the number were some who rose to great eminence, as Bishop Butler, Archbishop Secker, and Josiah Hort, Archbishop of Tuam, whom Dr. Watts, his fellow-student, describes as 'the first genius' in Mr. Rowe's Academy. Dr. Calamy expressed his surprise that men who scrupled to subscribe the first of the Articles, as Nonconformists, should yet be willing to conform and subscribe the whole Thirty-nine. The reason, however, is not difficult to find. It is simply that by this time, in spite of all the impositions of 1662, there was more actual freedom in the Established Church than among the Nonconformists. Subscription had ceased to be a bondage. The Exeter ministers were expelled, though they were scarcely Arian, certainly not more than Samuel Clarke was an Arian, who yet satisfied Convocation that he was orthodox. The successors, however,

both of those who were expelled and of those who subscribed, became definitely Arians, and some of them Unitarians. The spirit of inquiry connected with these changes of belief originated in the Church of England, and was afterwards taken up by the Nonconformists. It is simple history that throughout the eighteenth century the Church, with the imposed creed, and the creedless Churches, had their parallel parties of orthodox and Liberal.

The proposition for a confession of faith was introduced into the French Synod by Professor Bois of Montauban. It declared the fidelity of the Reformed Church to the principles of faith and liberty on which it had been founded—‘*Avec ses pères et ses martyrs dans la Confession de la Rochelle, avec toutes les Eglises de la Réformation dans leurs symboles, elle proclame l'autorité souveraine des saintes Ecritures en matière de foi, et le salut par la foi en Jésus Christ, Fils unique de Dieu, mort pour nos offenses et ressuscité pour notre justification. Elle conserve donc et elle maintient, à la base de son enseignement, de son culte et de sa discipline, les grands faits Chrétiens représentés dans ses solennités religieuses et exprimés dans ses liturgies, notamment dans la confession des péchés, dans le symbole des Apôtres, et dans la liturgie de la Sainte Cène.*’ This was a brief creed, and considering it as coming from the orthodox side, it was very moderate. The disposition of the synod in this respect contrasts favourably with that of the English Convocation, which, to satisfy the scruples of the whole Broad Church party, with Lord Shaftesbury’s ‘noble army’ of Evangelicals, refuses to sur-

render even so much as one good Catholic curse. There is, of course, this difference, that the English Church is in possession of its creeds, while the French Reformed is only striving to regain its creeds.

The first point in the new confession is the sovereign authority of the Scriptures in matters of faith. This is a point with which in one sense no Protestant Church can dispense. As against the authority of the Church of Rome, the Protestant has nothing on which he can lean but the Scriptures. Without the Scriptures he knows nothing of Christianity. They are the original documents of his religion. If the authority of the Church is renounced, he must turn to the Scriptures, and deal with them according to the reality of the case. But sovereign authority is an expression capable of a very wide meaning. When applied to a book like the Bible, which was written 'at sundry times and in divers manners,' we must have a reason for ascribing it either to every individual book in the Bible or to the Bible as a whole. In the latter case we rest upon what is called the canon, the history and origin of which are involved in the deepest darkness. Without the authority of the Church, we can assign no reason for one book being in the canon, and other books, believed to have been written at the same time and by Apostolic men, excluded. The Protestant principle requires free inquiry as to the origin and character of the Scriptures, as the very first step after renouncing the authority of the Church. The authority of the canon as such failing, we must turn to that of individual books. But here again perplexity pursues us. Concerning the origin of many of the

books of the Bible, we have not even the pretence of a record. We come at last to the contents of the books, and for these we must bring with us the two great enemies both of the Catholics and the Evangelicals, reason and conscience. 'No one,' said a Liberal speaker in the Synod, 'believes the sovereign authority of the Song of Solomon.'—'I do,' replied an Evangelical; 'I believe it.' We can scarcely estimate the value of the sovereign authority of a book whose meaning is past finding out, if it be not the obvious one which shows it to have been written on the delectable mountains of the pleasures of sense.

But reason and conscience have to be still further employed before we can reach any conclusion concerning the divinity of the Scriptures. The proposition of M. Bois does not embrace any extravagant theory of inspiration. It does not claim authority for the Scriptures except in matters of faith. Histories, figures, science, and everything which is not a matter of faith is left open. What can any Liberal wish more than this? How can any Evangelical be satisfied with only this? But from the orthodox side is there really any ground for this distinction? The sovereign authority of the Scriptures is not limited to certain books, nor to certain parts of books, but to certain contents which are called matters of faith, and these matters of faith are not discernible by any external evidence. The impossibility of making the distinction between what is a matter of faith and what is not, shows clearly that the Scriptures do not claim that kind of sovereign authority which the Evangelicals ascribe to them, or rather the kind of authority which M. Bois's proposi-

tion ascribes to the Scriptures, is no authority at all. It leaves the question open as to the meaning of the Scriptures, and the Liberals only ask that reason and conscience may be used to determine what contents of the Scriptures are divine.

The first objection which the Liberals made to the creed was its vagueness. It was not worth the trouble of the orthodox to pass it. The only way left by which we can know the divine in the Scriptures is by what in England we call the 'verifying faculty' within. The Liberals at the Synod saw clearly that, after granting so much, it was illogical in the Evangelicals not to grant all that they wanted. M. Vaguié argued that the Liberal view of the Scriptures was fairly inferred from the confession of Rochelle. No question has been so trying to Protestants as the question how they know the Scriptures to be the Word of God. We are familiar with the sad shifts to which the old divines of the Church of England were driven when pressed by Roman Catholic controversialists to answer this question. They did not, like the modern 'Catholic' Anglicans, fall back on the authority of the Church. That could not be done logically by those who denied the infallibility of the Church. The only other alternative was that of the Calvinistic confessions, which relied on the testimony of the Spirit. To this Laud and Chillingworth and Stillingfleet appealed. But this testimony is internal. It speaks to something within man; it is a renunciation of external testimony. M. Vaguié identified it with the testimony of conscience.

It is not, of course, for a moment supposed that the men who wrote the Protestant Confessions, understood by the Spirit the human conscience. They meant that the Bible, as a whole book, had authority, and that the evidence of this was in the book itself. The Scriptures were even supposed to testify to their own genuineness and canonicity. But the theory broke down as soon as men had time to examine it. The Liberals maintain that their doctrine is the legitimate result. What the conscience feels to be true in the Scripture, that is true. They start with the facts of the spiritual life. The accuracy of the Gospel histories, or the correctness of doctrines taught by Apostles, is a matter indifferent. The Scripture contains the word of God, but it is not itself the word of God. The faith by which the Church is one is defined by Pastor Fontanés as ‘une acte de sentiment et de volonté, et non une question de doctrine:’ a feeling of the soul, rather than a belief of the intellect. It is true that this feeling leads men to systematize their beliefs. But the root and essence is the religious sentiment. Christianity is this sentiment, as determined by Jesus, who has given it a new life and a new seed. On this ground, M. Coquerel maintained that their differences were divinely appointed. Jesus wishes this variety. It existed in the Primitive Church. Peter and Paul were not agreed. James differed from Paul about faith and works. Two of the four Gospels contain no trace of the divinity of Jesus Christ or of His miraculous birth. It is St. John and St. Paul who speak of ‘the Word made flesh.’ ‘If God,’ said M. Coquerel, ‘has put so many

diversities in His Scripture, it is not a synod which shall reform the work of God.'

Some of the Liberals not only denied the accuracy of the Scriptures, but fell into the mistake natural to negative teachers, of violently interpreting the Scriptures, to make them agree with their own belief. This is surely unnecessary, after infallibility has been denied to the sacred writers. Few men are satisfied to estimate fairly the precise amount of evidence that belongs to their side. M. Fontanés, who is evidently a young man, argued that the word 'resurrection,' in the New Testament, did not mean the return of a dead body to life. Now, whatever may be the belief of M. Fontanés as to resurrection, and whether his belief be the true one or not, it is not to be denied, nor is it necessary to deny, that the resurrection of the dead in the New Testament means what an ordinary person would understand by the words. It is perfectly likely that the material body will not rise again. St. Paul seems to say it will not, but rather what is sown a natural body, will be raised a spiritual body. So long as we are ignorant, both of matter and of spirit, the nature of the resurrection is a subject evidently beyond our knowledge. But St. Paul never intended that what he said of the resurrection of spiritual bodies should be so understood as to deny the resurrection of Christ's body, in the sense of the Evangelists. Whatever may be the explanation of the miracle of Christ's resurrection, St. Paul evidently believed it as a miracle. He believed that the body did not lie in the grave, but that it was seen by many persons,

and finally ascended visibly into heaven. M. Fontanés argues more like an Evangelical than a Liberal, when he explains St. Paul's account of Christ's resurrection, as merely the soul of Jesus ascending from *Sheol* to the place of blessedness.

The rest of the confession was criticized in order. M. Colani objected to it altogether as too theological. It did not correspond to Alexander Vinet's description of a confession of faith, that it should 'flow from the lips of the child, the old man, or the dying.' It was, however, so simple, that M. Colani could not see how it could be identified with the Confession of Rochelle. The metaphysical doctrines were ignored. The Holy Spirit was not mentioned. The divinity of Christ was only alluded to under the vague phrase 'only Son of God.' Salvation by faith was mentioned, but did the Synod mean by salvation, what Rome or Calvin meant—hell escaped and heaven gained—or only a moral fact? 'Died for our sins,' was also vague; if it included the idea of expiation, that ought to have been stated. 'Risen for our justification,' was one of St. Paul's obscure phrases, and nobody could say what it meant. M. Colani then noticed the untenable distinction between matters of faith, and matters not of faith. For the believer in inspiration, everything in the Bible is matter of faith; history, astronomy, geology. If criticism may be exercised on the narratives of Scripture, where is it to stop? Every miracle will be contested. If the Church does not interpret the Scriptures for the individual, the individual must interpret them for himself, and in that case what is the use of a creed?

The Liturgy of a Communion, Colani described as Pelagian. He objected to the Apostles' Creed, even with explanations of the 'descent into hell,' and the 'resurrection of the flesh.' He did not believe in the supernatural, and he could say the same for some of his particular friends on the left.

After making allowance for the peculiarities of individuals we may form some idea of the general scheme of the Liberals. Their conception of Christianity is so different from what we have been taught to receive, that it is no wonder some should regard them as setting forth another Gospel. The Liberals, however, persist in maintaining that the difference between them and the Evangelicals is not so great as it is supposed to be. They see no necessity for separation. They believe in Christianity. They believe that God through Christ has revealed Himself to the world, and that the greatest and most patent fact connected with this revelation is the resurrection of men to the life of righteousness. Christianity is to them a kingdom of God analogous to the kingdom of nature. They do not admit miracles. They deny, or at least doubt, the supernatural, that is, the supernatural in the ordinary sense. But they confess it again in another sense. The kingdom of God, though analogous to the natural, they find to be supernatural. It is there that God works in the hearts of men. It is there that God teaches men lessons which they could never learn in the realm of mere nature. It is a supernatural kingdom; not that it is without law and order, not that it is unlike the natural, but that it is literally and truly *above* the

natural. The men who have come to this view of Christianity in France and Germany, as well as in England, are not men who have the spirit of unbelief. They cannot be denounced as mere Rationalists or Free-Thinkers. They are mostly men who have been penetrated with the deepest religious life of the Churches to which they belong. They have walked about Sion and marked well her bulwarks, anxious to find a sure foundation for religion without the necessity of denying the marvellous discoveries that have been made in the natural world. It would doubtless be a gain to Christianity if its truth could be established on the simple facts of religious experience. The limits, however, of this experience must be acknowledged. Our religious sentiments may be to us a personal assurance. They may be also a guide in life, but they can never give that for which the intellect craves—a demonstration of the truth of what religion promises. The orthodox side pretends to do this, but fails. Whatever rests on authority can have no more validity than the authority on which it rests. The infallibility of a church or a book must be proved before their authority be received.

There are doubtless many questions to be settled before this view of Christianity can find its way in the world. It was repeated by several of the Liberals at the Synod that what we have really to do with is the practical part of Christianity. Our theology should be that of the Sermon on the Mount. Confessions of faith are metaphysical, and not suited to the understandings of the multitude. This is plausible, but there is another side. The religious mind has

always been tenacious of its creed. Metaphysics and mysteries are its natural nourishment. Rothe once said that if there were no miracles it would be necessary to invent some. Religion hitherto has only existed in alliance with superstition. It is a question if the zeal of the first Christians could have been sustained without the belief in the supernatural as they understood it. It is a question if the piety of some of our High Churchmen could be sustained without the sacramental bread and wine. These are the little idols that serve for tangible deities. If taken away, they would exclaim, with Micah, 'Ye have taken away my gods, and what have I more?' It is doubtful if some of our modern Revivalists, who have contributed most largely to the religious life of our day, could have done anything without the metaphysical beliefs which the Liberals say are the great hindrances in the way of the reception of Christianity. If the Liberals can give us Christianity without the usual weaknesses of Christian men—if they can demonstrate the possibility of religion without superstition, they will have solved the greatest problem that now perplexes the Christian world.

After the hard things which some of the Evangelicals said against the Liberals, it is satisfying to find that the Synod has not taken measures which will compel their secession. 'We do not wish you to separate,' said M. Guizot, and this sentiment was repeated by many of the most decided on the orthodox side. The difficulty of their working together has been already shown. When M. Coquerel pleaded for union, arguing that if the Evangelists had the truth,

they should allow it to leaven the whole lump, he was shrewdly answered that the leaven should be prepared apart. Another speaker said that their remaining in one Church was not union, but discord. This was all right from the Evangelical stand-point. Wisdom, however, prevailed in the Synod. 'A separation,' said M. Pécaut, 'is the work of a moment—reunion requires centuries.' The united force of Protestantism is wanted in the conflict with Atheism and Catholic superstition. The past history of all Churches teaches that there is but little gain in thrusting out earnest men, whose services at any time the world can ill afford to lose.

The Synod concluded by deciding that they should ask the separation of the Church from the State. Liberals and Evangelicals vied with each other in declaring this to be necessary for the prosperity of their Church. We have more than once said in this Review that the question of the union of Church and State is altogether a question of circumstances. In England it is the Evangelicals, and still more the Liberals, who are the most strenuous supporters of this union. The last regard it as the bulwark of liberal Christianity. The French State certainly has rarely been the expression of uprightness. Even the Catholic Church in France does not look back with any satisfaction on its connection with the State. It has learned that for its own interests it is safer to trust to the Pope and the Catholic hierarchy than to the favour of princes. We do not, however, believe it possible for Churches and States to be permanently separate. If they are not in union they will come

into collision. The Reformed Church may be separated from the State under the presidency of M. Thiers, but the next government may regard it as a dangerous community, and even refuse it a concordat. This is not likely to be the case with the Reformed Church. But it is quite likely that the Catholic Church may again possess wealth equal to what it had before the Revolution. It may then be really dangerous to the State, and in self-defence the State may have again to take the Church's property, and in return to salary its priests, or perhaps to banish them, as Bismarck has had to do with the Jesuits. We do not know what there is in the State-connection in France which makes the Reformed Church desirous to be free from it, especially after the amount of liberty conferred by the President of the Republic. If there is any benefit in the State-connection, they renounce that and give it up to the Catholics. If, as the Non-conformists in England say, the State-connection produces inequality among the ministers of the different Churches, the Protestants are giving up a vantage-ground which they now possess. If, as Matthew Arnold says, to be out of the national Church is to be separated from the currents of national life, then the French Protestants are taking steps to become a little sect as narrow and peculiar as some of the little sects [in England. But it is just possible that their future history may show that these theories are, like the webs of spiders, very fragile and very easily swept away. The Synod has acted deliberately, and has probably done what is best in the circumstances.

There were deputations from many foreign Churches, but we have not read of one from the Houses of Convocation. This, however, is of small moment. The Church of England has not forgotten its old helper and ally, the Church of the Huguenots. With their Evangelicals our Evangelicals have the deepest sympathy, and to their Liberals our Liberals wish health and prosperity.

XIII.

A VISIT TO MUNICH.*

I MIGHT call my tour this year an Ecclesiastical journey. Its main object was to become personally acquainted with the excommunicated Professors of Munich, but all the way, both going and returning, places connected with Church history were to me the chief places of interest. I began with Rotterdam, the birthplace of Erasmus, and then proceeded to Dort, in memory of the famous Synod. I visited the island of Bommel, where Grotius was imprisoned, and Gorcum, the place from which he escaped, when he emerged from the chest in which, by his wife's strategy, he had been conveyed across the river. I came to Cologne with its old churches, its strange legends, and its wonderful relics. This year the English traveller embarks on the Rhine with a feeling of thankfulness that it is still German. The Rhine is the highway of Europe, and Frenchmen cannot be entrusted with highways. I saw Germania ever present, with her sleepless eye and her powerful arm,

* *Sunday Magazine*, November, 1871.

keeping religious watch over the noble river, while the very waves seemed to join in chorus to the patriotic song :—

‘Sie sollen ihn nicht haben
Den freien, deutschen Rhein,
Bis seine Fluth begraben
Des letzten Mann’s Gebein.’

One morning, by winding paths, encircled by vines and embosomed by oaks, I ascended the Drachenfels. In the afternoon I was at Velmich, unfrequented by tourists. I wished to visit the Mouse. After a long scramble up a steep path by the help of some bramble bushes, I was inside the ruined castle. It was now near sunset, and a little bird on the top of the old wall was singing a plaintive song in the calm evening solitude. The tower is high above the rock, but it is the opening into a pit whose bottom, it is said, is far beneath the Rhine, and from the depths of that pit at eventime is heard the tinkling of a bell, the memorial of an evil deed in a dark age. The Church of Velmich had a silver bell, which was coveted by Falkenstein, the Lord of the Mouse. He removed it from the church to the castle. The Abbot, vested in his robes of office, and with the cross borne before him, went to demand the bell. But, Falkenstein, who believed in neither God nor devil, caused the Abbot, with the bell tied round his neck, to be cast into the pit of the tower. And ever since, yea, whenever the chimes of the bells of a village church are wafted up the mountains, the traveller, with his ear at the top of the turret, may hear from below the mysterious music of the silver bell of the Abbot of Velmich. On the afternoon of the next day

I ascended to the Cat, and continued my walk over the summit of the Lurlei, till the shadows of the vines had ceased to lengthen, and the nymph of the rock had gone to her evening repose.

My next stage was Wiesbaden, and from thence I went to Homburg, where I saw the German Kaiser. He was in the theatre when I entered the town. I was very tired, but I sat down upon the grass amid the crowd, and waited till I heard the cry, 'The Kaiser comes.' Next day, I walked to Friedrichsdorf, a village where a colony of Huguenots settled after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. It was a primitive village, with no sign of any improvement since the first advent of the exiles. I visited the school, and found the schoolmaster in an arm-chair, smoking a prodigious pipe, as he imparted knowledge to the young inhabitants of Friedrichsdorf.

A desire to avoid travelling on Sunday caused me to stop one Saturday evening at a quiet country town called Gunzenhausen, about midway between Wurzburg and Munich. As I entered the town, a multitude of geese were coming from the fields. They divided themselves into little companies, every goose knowing the goose that belonged to its company, and every company knowing its own resting-place for the night. Next morning, the goose-woman marched through the town, and everybody's goose joined the other geese till they made a great flock, and cackled up the hill to the stubble-field. At half-past eight, the church bells were ringing, and the inhabitants of Gunzenhausen were hastening to their morning service. I followed their example, and found the old

church in every corner full. The people sang lustily, as only Germans can sing. In the centre of the church, over an altar, was a huge crucifix. On the walls were the two familiar portraits of Luther and Melancthon, and beneath Melancthon's portrait, in an opening in the wall, the statue of an old crusader. Two clergymen in black gowns read prayers, mostly with their backs to the people, and crossed themselves as frequently as if they had been Roman Catholic priests. The service was unmistakably Protestant, and yet it cut with sharp angles into all the peculiarities of English Protestantism. The prayers were read, yet the people had no prayer-books. The service therefore was not *common prayer* as in the Church of England, while the interest of extemporaneous or unread prayer was wanting. The sermon was followed by the communion. The question of the 'north side' does not seem ever to have disturbed the German Protestant. The minister consecrated standing before the high altar, with his back to the people; the crossings were frequent, but he never knelt. The people came up in threes, made a bow to the minister, knelt on the north side and received the bread. They then walked behind the altar to the south side, bowed to the other minister, and kneeling, received the wine. There were no rails in front. After the service I went over the church. The sacristan told me that the great crucifix had been allowed to stand at the Reformation, and had not since been removed. The altar was stone, the same high altar which had been in the church time out of mind. The wine used was the ordinary white wine of the district. This I thought must be a

Protestant innovation, but I was wrong. The same white wine, a Catholic priest told me, only mixed with a few drops of water, was used in the Catholic churches.

On reaching Munich I found that the Professors whom I wished to visit were all out of town. Dr. Frohschammer, whom I knew best, was spending his college vacation at Kreuth 'Bad,' in the Bavarian Highlands. I went by train to Holzkirche, and next day the omnibus moved slowly up the hill by the Lake Tigernsee, and into the bosom of the Alps. The waters of Kreuth, with the little Catholic chapel, were consecrated together by the Abbot of Tigernsee in the beginning of the last century. It is a place fortunately unknown to the English, frequented entirely by Germans, and where German life and manners reign in their uncorrupted simplicity. Among the visitors were Prussian Ministers of State, Professors from various Universities, Protestant clergymen and Catholic priests. Frohschammer is not immediately connected with the present Catholic movement in Bavaria. He was excommunicated seven years ago for maintaining the independence of science and the right of free inquiry, as opposed to Church authority. He represents a tendency which has always distinguished German Catholics from other Catholics—the tendency or disposition to find the grounds of Christianity, and even of Catholicism, in reason itself. The Catholic intellect of Germany has really been created by the Protestantism of Germany, and it has clung to Catholicism on supposed grounds of reason. But with these reasoning Catholics the authorities of Rome have ever been in conflict. The Church is founded on obedience to

authority, or what is called faith, in opposition to reason. That reason should ever lead to Catholic doctrines is a thesis which no Protestant could possibly maintain. And in this judgment those who rule the Church of Rome entirely agree with Protestants. Frohschammer was logical, and his logic led him to positions which the Church of Rome does not allow any priest to maintain. The open advocacy of the freedom of science by German priests and professors was one of the causes which led to the Vatican Council, which has determined with indisputable clearness that divine knowledge is not revealed through the intellect of man, but that it comes infallibly from the mouth of the Bishop of Rome.

Frohschammer is really at the head of a great but unorganized movement, which is anterior to Döllinger's, and to which at one time Döllinger was greatly opposed. He is at present in feeble health, and has almost lost his eyesight through close study. He has had to fight single-handed against a powerful hierarchy, and seems to bear the marks of one who has had a severe conflict. Before his excommunication he was preacher to the university and a popular professor, but after the frown of the Church fell upon him all candidates for the priesthood were forbidden to attend his lectures. In England persecution generally creates sympathy, but that stage of civilisation has not yet been reached in Catholic Bavaria. The professorship which Frohschammer holds is that of philosophy, and his theology is that which in England would be called the theology of a very advanced liberal. He maintains that the Church of Rome having erred in matters of

science which impinge on religion, has sufficiently disproved its claims to infallibility. He believes, also, that the leading dogmas of the Church of Rome, as well as many doctrines held by Protestants, are untenable in the face of modern science. In the *Contemporary Review* for August, the same month in which I was in Bavaria, there was an article by Father Dalgairns, written from the side of English Ultramontaniam, in which his theology was compared to that of Professor Maurice. Frohschammer described the article as mere rhetoric, intimating that the English priest had yet to study the subject.

I spent a week at the Bad, and had many conversations with all kinds of people on the events which are now agitating Catholic Bavaria. Our favourite place of meeting was the Rauch-Saal, which in plain English means the smoking-room. Here Protestant pastors sat close by Catholic priests, and profound professors poured out treasures of wisdom and knowledge. The hilarity was sometimes redundant, as German mirth often is, but not always disagreeable after quiet wanderings over the tops of mountains and up sequestered valleys.

I embraced every opportunity of making acquaintance with the priests. They are generally men of simple manners, within certain limits intelligent, and always willing to converse on subjects relating to the Church. They have nothing of that reserve or distrust of Protestants which priests in England seem to have. It was gratifying altogether to see the cordiality with which all parties conversed, the freedom with which they expressed their opinions, and the

entire absence of everything like passion or bad feeling. On making a new acquaintance among the priests I generally asked if he was an old Catholic or a new Catholic. The answer invariably was an old Catholic. 'You are then,' I would say, 'a follower of Döllinger.' 'No, no,' was sure to follow. 'Döllinger is not Catholic. He is a heretic, condemned and excommunicated by the Church.'

The 'Beneficiat' of Kreuth, like most of the young priests in Bavaria, was a thorough Ultramontane. He always sat next to me in the Rauch-Saal, to make sure, as he said, that I got correct information concerning the Catholic Church. He was a very intelligent man, with an open generous face, and a high sense of his duty as a Catholic priest. He had been a pupil of Döllinger's, but could only lament the 'sad' aberration of his master. I could not despise the sincerity, nor in every case the logic of those who took the Ultramontane side. From the stand-point of what I always understood to be Catholicism they seemed to be right. The Catholic Church, they said, is committed to the new dogma, and before all things it is necessary to abide by the Catholic Church. I could not help admitting that if I were a Catholic I would go in for the new dogma, and for every new dogma which the Church decreed. Of Döllinger's movement the priests spoke as of the movement of any other heretic. It disturbed men's minds for a time, but the Catholic Church could afford to wait. It outlives all heresies and all heretics. The new dogma, one priest said to me, is strange at first, but it is not strange when it is explained. The Catholic mind, he added, must accept it

as soon as it regains its Catholic balance. From this he concluded that Döllinger's movement, as regards Catholics, was virtually at an end. The blind believing tendency of the Catholic mind was to me only too obvious. The priests themselves seemed to be all of the character of simple believers. All parties testified that their lives were irreproachable, and in the main their influence good; but their believing was of that kind which has no foundation. Like the geese at Gunzenhausen their Catholicity consists in following the same goose-woman. A liberal priest, who had ceased to believe in the Pope, said to me that he regarded the faith of the multitude of the priests as unbelief, for they take it as a matter of course, and think nothing at all about it.

After leaving Kreuth, I returned to Munich. Next morning I had some conversation with Professor Friedrich, who gave me all the information that I desired concerning his part in the 'Old Catholic' movement. Friedrich is a young man, with a remarkably bright and intelligent face. In my judgment the future of the movement rests in a great measure with him. He has less of Döllinger's cautious diplomacy, but more of the eagerness and decision which are necessary to make a successful reformer. When the Archbishop of Munich pronounced the excommunications, Friedrich's counsel was to disregard them, and continue their clerical duties as before. Part of them, I believe, he has continued. It was reported while I was in Bavaria that he had performed the marriage service under the protection of the chief magistrate, who had caused the door of the church to

be forced open, the archbishop having taken possession of the keys.

My interview with Professor Friedrich was short. I rose in haste, saying that I must go to Tutzing to find Dr. Döllinger. 'He is here,' said the Professor; 'he returned yesterday.' I was glad to hear these words, and glad that I had not already started for Tutzing. Dr. Döllinger, whose reputation at the present moment is not merely European, but as extensive as Christendom, does not live in a palace. He has no fine deanery or rectory house. He has not even a lodge, like our 'heads of Houses' in Oxford and Cambridge. He lives up a stair, in what is called in Scotland a 'flat.' Professor Friedrich lives above him in the third story. In a few minutes after leaving Professor Friedrich I was in the presence of Dr. Döllinger. I happened to have in my hand a copy of the August number of the *Contemporary Review*, of which I requested his acceptance. He took it gladly, expressing his thanks, and saying that he was glad to see it. 'I have heard,' he continued, 'that it contains an article, by Father Dalgairns, on Papal Infallibility, and abusing us poor Germans.' He had evidently heard of the article from some one who had not read it. I said that the article had no immediate reference to him; it was rather intended for Professor Frohschammer and the liberal theologians. There was of course the further inference that the free exercise of reason which Frohschammer demanded for science Döllinger demanded for history, and so they were both in the same category as rebels against the authority of the Church. I merely intimated this inference without putting it so as to

evoke an answer. Döllinger asked if I was a *collaborateur* on the *Review*, which I answered in the affirmative. He then inquired for the Dean of Westminster, calling him with apparent pride his friend, and saying that he understood he also wrote for the *Contemporary Review*. He then spoke of the late Dean Alford, and, noticing an article by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, he spoke of Dr. Ellicott's works as if he were familiar with them.

I told him that in England we were in great darkness as to his position, that all sects and parties took an immense interest in the movement with which he was connected, but that we could not get any authoritative or reliable account of what he intended to do. He answered, that the position he had taken up was a very difficult one. The Catholic mind was trained to cling to the Church, and to sacrifice all for unity. He would not form a sect, he would not leave the Church, but the protest which had been made would stand in history as a witness that the new dogma was not the doctrine of the Catholic Church. 'But how,' I said, 'can you defend the œcumenicity of Trent and deny that of the Vatican?' The answer was, that all the bishops did not vote for the dogma of infallibility. 'But,' I said, 'they have since all, or almost all, submitted. The voice of the Episcopate is the voice of the Church on the "Old Catholic" theory of the Church, and now that the bishops of the opposition have submitted, the "infallible Church" has declared for the infallibility of the Pope.' I said that Dr. Dorner, of Berlin, had recently written an article for the *Contemporary Review*, in which he demonstrates

that on the very principles of Gallicanism the new dogma must be received. The Church itself has voted for it. Döllinger said that he had not seen Dorner's article, but that he knew the Protestants did not wish him success. The bishops who had submitted were not to be reckoned. They submitted as Catholics for the sake of peace and unity, but they have not declared for papal infallibility.

I was certainly not prepared for this argument; but as my object was to learn, I listened. I however intimated that Protestants did wish him success, but they could not see that he had sufficient ground on which to stand. If the dogma was a false dogma, and yet was received to the extent it is by the Catholic hierarchy, then most assuredly the gates of hell have prevailed against the Catholic Church. The opposition to the dogma which at one time seemed to be formidable is now almost nothing. I expressed a wish to see the 'Old Catholics' more decided in their opposition to the Church of Rome. It was now in the hands of the Ultramontanes; in fact, had become Ultramontane. It was no longer the Catholic Church which 'Old Catholics' had supposed it to be. I expressed doubts if by adhering to the Church they were not supporting that very Ultramontanism which they meant to oppose. Dr. Döllinger answered that the human mind craved rest in religion. It must lean upon something objective. Protestantism was too subjective. The mind of the worshipper was always liable to be disturbed by the individuality of the minister. This want in Protestantism, he said, had given rise to the powerful party in the Church

of England, at the head of which was Dr. Pusey. I admitted that in religion the multitude are governed more by feeling than by reason. From this I argued that they are thus very liable to become an easy prey to the Ultramontane powers. These powers will train the priests even more than they do now to absolute obedience, and segregate them more than ever from the influences of secular life and secular learning. Without a decided opposition to the Church of Rome the breach between reason and religion, already far too wide, will widen every day. The party of whom he spoke in the Church of England did not probably themselves see it, but they were among the best supporters of Ultramontaniam. Dr. Dollinger admitted the truth of a great deal that I said; but from his own stand-point he made a long and clear answer. He contended that the opposition to Ultramontaniam would be more effective by their continuing in the Church. He said that in Germany the consequences which I anticipated were impossible. The education of the people is in the hands of the State, so that Ultramontaniam can never have even the power which it has among the Catholics in England. He spoke of the indifference of the educated laity as one of the greatest hindrances in his way. Those who could not reason regarded him as a destroyer of the Church, and those who could reason did nothing. He was not disposed to measure the success of his cause by the number of priests either for it or against it. He illustrated this by the case of the English priests at the time of the Reformation. They were Protestants under Edward, Catholics under Mary, and again

Protestants under Elizabeth. When the tide set in with the laity, the priests would go with the stream.

I drew arguments from the very facts which Döllinger had mentioned. The influence of the schoolmaster is only negative. It creates that very indifference which looks on and does nothing. The only effectual opposition to the Church of Rome must be a religious opposition. The religious element in man must be satisfied with a rational religion, otherwise it will feed on superstition.

These views I expressed freely, but with the consciousness that I was in the presence of a man who had weighed well the words which he uttered. He was fighting with his own sword, clad in his own armour, and with the discretion and caution for which he is renowned, in agreement with his own motto—*'Nil temere, nil timide, sed omnia concilio et virtute.'* Yet to a Protestant, Dr. Döllinger can only appear as one whose eyes are but half opened, and who as yet can only see men as trees walking. The multitude of his supporters, I was told, are even now beyond him. The rational Catholics who agree with Frohschammer hail him only in expectation that he will and must take up a more decided position. The policy of staying in has been tried by all reformers, but unexpected circumstances have determined their action. Luther wished to remain in the Catholic Church. His demand was a free general council which would represent the Church. The same demand is made by the 'Old Catholics;' but where is the council to come from if the bishops go with the Pope? Our own Reformers wished to remain in

the Catholic Church. Even under Elizabeth they complained that they had been excluded from the Council of Trent; but Rome was resolute, and their only choice was separation or annihilation. Fénelon, Quesnel, and in later times La Mennais, remained in the Church, but only to give the Church more power of boasting how thoroughly their heresies had been crushed, and, I may add, the men too, especially when I think of the sad end of the great La Mennais.

My interview with Dr. Döllinger had a sudden, almost a ludicrous, ending. I had just begun to think about leaving, when the door-bell rang, and the servant brought in a card. The old professor adjusted his spectacles, but failed to be able to read the name. 'Some of your countrymen!' he said; and handing me the card asked if I could read the name. But even at the request of Dr. Döllinger I could not utter it. It was the name of an English Ritualist who has made himself vile by reviling the Reformers. There are many strange delusions in this world, but surely one of the oddest is the supposition that there is really anything in common between the English Ritualists and the excommunicated professors of Munich. They are like men who have met each other on the highway. For a moment they are on the same spot, but their faces are in opposite directions. The Ritualist is the Ultramontane of the Church of England. His spirit is that of the Ultramontane. He has turned his back on light and reason, and is gone in search of darkness and authority. He is opposed to the very influences which have put the Munich professors where they are.

After leaving Dr. Döllinger I visited the churches and public places of Munich. There were not many people in the churches, and to me the worship was not edifying. The priest in every church was going through that strange performance which is called the mass,

‘And muckle Latin he did mumble,
But I heard nought but hummel bummel.’

The wonder in my mind was not that Frohschammer, Döllinger, and Friedrich had opposed the dogma of papal infallibility, but that they had ever encouraged such superstition as I saw in the Munich churches. In some of them the ‘idols’ are more grotesque and more hideous than those which the missionaries bring from China and Hindostan. In the ‘Theatiner Kirche’ there were several women bowing and crossing themselves like lunatics before a mulatto image of the Virgin Mary, which had a round laughing face like the full moon. Did Dr. Döllinger, I asked myself, ever witness the like of this without a fiercer indignation than he has manifested against the new dogma of infallibility? Did Professor Frohschammer, with his clear reasoning intellect, ever go to and fro before an altar making odd mutterings, as if he had converted bread and wine into the Deity? Is the new dogma more irrational than transubstantiation? Is it more irrational than the dogma of the immaculate conception? It is to me inexplicable that any Catholic can receive the decrees of Trent and stumble at those of the Vatican. But surely now the consummation has been reached. I rejoiced that the new dogma had been proclaimed, for by it the

whole Church system is stultified, and every pretence to Catholicism in any intelligible sense logically annihilated.

Dr. Döllinger told me of a great congress that was soon to be held in Munich, when the movement would take a more definite form. That congress has since been held, and its proceedings published, but they do not yet point to any definite course of action. The 'Old Catholics' still dream of reforming the Church of Rome, of making it the true home of pure and undefiled religion, and of adapting it to the necessities of this age of the world. To make the great communion which goes by the name of the Roman Catholic Church the teacher of a rational theology, and the champion of 'science, freedom, and the truth in Christ,' is indeed a glorious dream. There is not a Protestant living, worthy of the name, who does not in this wish them the utmost success. But we separated from the Church of Rome at the Reformation, and we remain separate from it still, just because we believe that the whole tendency, character, constitution, and all which really makes the Church of Rome what it is, as distinct from other Churches, is totally opposed to all which the 'Old Catholics' wish it to be. The stand-point of Protestantism was a true one, and multitudes of Catholics who opposed the Reformation would have been on its side had the real character of the Church of Rome been as definite as it is to-day.

From Munich I went to Augsburg, famous in the history of the Reformation, and from Augsburg to Lindau. Next day I crossed the Lake to Constance,

famous in the history of the 'Infallible Church.' The building in which the great Council met still stands by the lake, but it is now a warehouse with lines of rail for the conveyance of goods passing through the centre. I visited the minster, to see the shrine of Bishop Hallam, of Salisbury, the chief of the English deputation to the Council of Constance. In the St. Paul's Strasse I saw the house where John Huss lived. There is a rude effigy of the reformer over the door with a verse of poetry in old German. In a field outside of the town is the place where he was burned. It is surrounded with a railing, and guarded as a sacred spot by those who reverence the memory of the early martyr.

The friendly Rhine rushing from the lake carried me from Constance to Shaffhausen. Next day I walked to the Rhine Falls, to see the river splashing over the rocks as it bids farewell to Switzerland. After visiting Basel I came to Strasburg, where the workmen were all busy restoring the houses that had been destroyed in the war. By Saarbruck and Saargemund I came to Treves, where the ghost of the old Roman empire still lingers amid the ruins of baths and amphitheatres. At the Luxembourg I saw the workmen beginning to dismantle the fortifications, which are one of the wonders of the world. It is worth recording that during this long journey I never had cause to complain of any overcharge till I came to Constance. The hotel-keeper was a Frenchman, and a Frenchman can cheat a guest with a dash of his pen, irrespective of conscience or consequences. The landlord of 'The Pike,' like that voracious fish,

lurketh in secret places and 'ravisheth the poor when he getteth him into his den.' I expressed a hope that he was patriotic enough to be collecting the milliards for Bismarek. The only other trouble I had in my travels was from another Frenchman, who sold the tickets at the railway station in Strasburg. He wanted to have an English sovereign for twenty francs, and when I objected he refused the sovereign at any price. It was the first time that I had seen the image and superscription of Queen Victoria dishonoured. Fortunately I had time to go to an exchange office. When I returned I told the clerk, before a company of Strasburghers, that it was a good thing they would soon be under German rule, and I hoped that they would make some progress under the administration of Bismarek, so that English travellers might no longer be annoyed with French folly and French perversity.

XIV.

THE JANSENISTS AND THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH OF UTRECHT.

THE recent visit of the Archbishop of Utrecht to the Old Catholics of Bavaria brings to memory a very interesting chapter in ecclesiastical history. It is natural for Protestants to suppose that since the Reformation the Church of Rome has had no varieties. Certainly it has not wished to have any. Its final ideal is uniformity of opinion, and to accomplish this it inculcates absolute submission to authority in matters of faith. But differences have arisen not only as to doctrines, but even with reference to this submission and the nature of this authority.

We wish at present to avoid passing any judgment on the doctrines of Jansen. He revived in the Church of Rome what are sometimes called the doctrines of grace. It has been the misfortune of theology to get encumbered with words and phrases that require elaborate explanations. Grace and faith seem very simple words in the New Testament, and doubtless they are very simple to many ordinary Christians, but

in controversial divinity they are very complex. The controversy between the Jansenists and the Jesuits was in substance the same as that among Protestants under the names of Calvinists and Arminians. And both of these were but renewals of the old warfare between Augustine and Pelagius.

When Luther began to preach justification by faith, he did not suppose that he was preaching any new doctrine. He found it in Fathers and Schoolmen. It had been approved by Popes and Councils. But the question was easily raised, if Luther meant the same thing as they did by the same words. We do not know that Luther ever satisfactorily answered this question. We do not know if his explanation of justification by faith be capable of defence in all its theological relations. But practically he had got hold of a doctrine which moved the world. Its real meaning was actual inward religion. The error he had to combat was not peculiar to the Church of Rome. It was the old error of the Jews, who expected to be saved by the ceremonial law, while their hands were full of wickedness. It was the same error which made Italian banditti the strictest observers of the injunctions of the Church. It is a very natural error, and very common in some measure to all men. It puts mere religion in the place of righteousness. It makes men suppose that the moral law may be violated, and atonement made by some external religious duties. Luther said no. Religion to be real must be inward. St. Paul said the same to the Jews in his day. So did Isaiah and all the prophets. They made righteousness more acceptable to God than

sacrifice, and a contrite heart of more value than rivers of oil.

After the Reformation there were still two parties in the Church of Rome, who differed about the theological doctrine of justification by faith. One party said that the surest way to check the spread of Lutheranism was to preach the doctrines of the Church, which were those of St. Augustine. But the spirit of opposition has always been a malignant spirit. Luther had taught justification by faith, and therefore the Church of Rome must now declare for justification by works. At the Council of Trent the Jesuits determined to condemn Luther's doctrine without mitigation or modification. The Archbishop of Sienna and some other bishops maintained that justification was solely due to the merits of Christ through faith. Cardinal Pole entreated the Council not to condemn a doctrine merely because it was held by Luther. But the Jesuits were immovable. They were able to pass decrees with anathemas, declaring that man was justified by works, and not by faith alone. The minority had recourse to explanations. They explained the decrees of Trent so as to agree with Augustine, and by the same arguments they could have made them agree with Luther and Calvin. The Jesuits continued to go still further from justification by faith alone. Molina said that free-will, without the aid of grace, could produce good works, and that it was not till free-will produced faith, love, and repentance that grace was bestowed. The Dominicans opposed the Jesuits. An appeal was made to Rome to have the dispute settled. Pope Clement VIII.

agreed with the Dominicans, but he postponed his decision, as the Jesuits were the best friends of the Papacy. Under the next Pope, Paul V., it was decided that the Jesuits should be condemned, and when the 'proper time' came the decision was to be published. The 'proper time,' however, has not yet come:

Cornelius Jansen, or, as we would say in English, Johnson, was born at Leerdam, in Holland. He studied at the universities of Utrecht and Louvain. His health was feeble, but his devotion to study was unceasing. At Louvain he met Jean Baptiste du Vergier Hauranne, afterwards known as St. Cyran. They met again at Paris, and for six years they lived together at M. de Hauranne's house in Bayonne. Jansen undertook the mastership of the new college at Bayonne, and his friend was chosen a canon of the cathedral. Their chief studies for these years were the writings of the Fathers, and especially of St. Augustine. In 1617 Jansen returned to Paris, and soon after to Louvain, where he was made director of the College of St. Pulcheria. In Louvain he was successful in preventing the Jesuits from establishing professorships in the university. His great learning was soon known throughout Europe. Various bishoprics were designed for him. But he had powerful enemies in Cardinal Richelieu and the Jesuits. He was made Chancellor of the University, and in 1636 was consecrated Bishop of Ypres. The French Church at this time had but few bishops like Jansen. Out of the twenty-four hours he slept only four, and that frequently in the same chair in which he read and

wrote. He was never weary in serving the poor. He began a great reformation in his diocese; but he had not been long bishop when the plague broke out in Flanders. The inhabitants fled in every direction; but Jansen fulfilled his office, standing continually by the sick and the dying, dressing their wounds, giving them food and medicine, and administering the last consolations of religion. But the dire contagion did not spare the devoted bishop. He died in 1638, before he had presided two full years over the see of Ypres.

Jansen died in the faith of the Catholic Church as he understood it. More than this, he was willing to accept as the Catholic faith whatever was decreed to be so by the Roman See. He left ready for publication a work called 'Augustinus,' on which he had spent twenty years. With his dying hand he wrote to Pope Urban VIII., submitting the important work to his judgment, and requesting the Pontiff to alter or rescind any part of it which did not meet his approbation. To the same effect, he wrote in his will that he was an obedient son of the Church, and if the Roman see wished anything in his book to be altered, it would be altered. The letter to the Pope was suppressed by Jansen's executors. Fearing the procrastination of the Roman Court and the wiles of the Jesuits, they determined to have the work published at once. In 1640 it appeared at Louvain, and in 1642, it was condemned in a Bull by Pope Urban. The Court of Rome, it is said, decided to condemn 'Augustinus' because of a passage in which Augustine was quoted as authorising a point already condemned

at Rome. The Jesuits, however, were not content. Jansen was an old enemy, and they must make the most of their victory. They proclaimed him a heresiarch, and seventeen years after his death, the inscription over his tombstone was defaced, the tomb demolished, and the body of the sainted bishop removed from the Cathedral. This had been done secretly, but by permission of his successor in the see of Ypres.

As Protestants, we might suppose that when the Papal Bull came, the matter was ended. But it requires a long time to understand the casuistry of the Roman Catholic Church. There are Catholics who believe that they are not obliged to receive a Bull, and there are so many senses in which a Bull may be received, that only those skilled in the Canon law can form a judgment of what a Bull really means. The strife went on till all France was troubled. An appeal was again made to Rome. Father Cornet drew up five propositions, which he said were taken from Jansen's work. These propositions were condemned by Innocent X. as heretical, false, rash, impious, and blasphemous. The subject of them was grace and merit. They were expressed in such language as would be used by an extreme or unguarded Calvinist. When the Jansenists were called upon to agree to the condemnation of the five propositions, they did so at once, but with the qualification that they did it only in their *heretical* sense, denying that the propositions were in Jansen. Meantime, the Jansenists, who had become very learned in antiquity, published anonymously an Epistle of St. Prosper to

Ruffinus. The Jesuits immediately condemned it as a new piece of Jansenist heresy. When it was known to be the work of a disciple of the great Augustine, it was soon discovered that it might be taken in an orthodox sense. The Jesuits were not to be beaten. They appealed to Rome again, to determine if the five propositions were really in Jansen's work. The Pope, extending his infallibility to matters of fact, decreed that they were. The Jansenists showed, from the highest authorities of the Church, that the Pope's infallibility did not reach to matters of fact. But this availed nothing. All were heretics who denied that the five propositions were in Jansen.

In 1620, three years after Jansen left Paris, M. de Hauranne was appointed Abbé of St. Cyran. To the earnest study of the Fathers, he added that of the Holy Scriptures, in which he found all truth. The Church, he said, is founded on the Scriptures, and by them God converts Jews and Gentiles. At Paris, he earned a great reputation for sanctity and learning. Cardinal Richelieu introduced him at Court as the most learned man in Europe. He was offered eight bishoprics in succession, but he sought seclusion. He retired to a Carthusian convent to spend his days in prayer and study, never appearing in the streets except on errands of piety and mercy. But his influence was not lost. It reached many persons of high rank in Paris who had been notorious for vice and profligacy, but who became sincere Christians. He insisted on the necessity of real repentance, and not a mere abstinence from outward sins. The Jesuits regarded this as a heresy. He was also charged with

denying that a priest can absolve from sin. He was finally accused of Jansenism, and immured as a heretic in the dungeon of Vincennes. Here, for a time, he was deprived of his books, and of pen and paper. His friends were not allowed to visit him. It is said that John de Wert, the Spanish General, was invited by Cardinal Richelieu to a magnificent ballet at his residence in Paris. Next day, the Cardinal asked the General what he considered the most marvellous spectacle he had ever seen. De Wert answered, 'that of all wonders he had ever seen, none had so much astonished him as to see, in the dominions of *his very Christian Majesty*, bishops amusing themselves at theatres, whilst saints languished in prison.' St. Cyran was released after five years' confinement, but his health was broken by the hardships he had endured in a damp cell. He had to undergo a surgical operation, and he was soon after seized with apoplexy. His sufferings were great, but he bore them patiently. 'What the Lord has permitted,' he said, 'we must receive with the same submission as what He has appointed.' He died in 1643, and was buried in the church of St. Jaques du Haut Pas, amid a great concourse of people, who revered him as a saint.

But the propaganda of Jansenism was the celebrated Abbey of Port Royal. It was situated in a wooded valley, near Chevreuse, about six leagues from Paris, and within view of St. Lambert and Vaumurier. It was founded in 1204, by Mathilde de Garlande, wife of the Lord of Marli, a younger son of the house of Montmorency. Whatever convents may have been at

their first institution, there is no controversy as to what they were in the sixteenth century. Self-indulgence had taken the place of self-denial, and the spirit of 'the world, the flesh, and the devil,' from which they were intended as a refuge, had made them its chief abode.

In 1602 Marie Angelique Arnauld was appointed abbess. Marie was a very young abbess, for she had not yet completed her eleventh year. The authorities who had the appointment certified to the Pope that she was seventeen. Catholics in that day, it would seem, made no scruple to impose on the 'Holy Father,' and the Pontiff had not yet declared his infallibility as to matters of fact. The nuns were delighted to have their little sister made abbess, for now they could do as they liked. This license, however, was of short duration. When Marie was seventeen the monastery was visited by a Capuchin friar. This man afterwards became a Protestant, and it is said that he had already resolved on this step. He preached in the church, and the abbess was deeply moved by his words. This was followed by an illness which lasted for some months. Henceforth she began a new life. Mère Angelique, as she was called, immediately set about a reformation in the convent. She refused to admit within the walls even her own father and mother. In a few years the monastery became, what at first it was intended to be, a house of piety, charity, and industry. It was soon evident that the Mère Angelique was no ordinary woman. Other abbesses came to consult her about the reformation of their convents. The members of Port Royal became so numerous that it was necessary to

open another house in Paris. To this the nuns migrated in 1625.

The Mère Angelique had six sisters, who were all nuns of Port Royal. She had also three brothers in eminent positions in the world. The eldest, Arnauld d'Andilly, was commissary-general to the army; another was Bishop of Angers; and the third was the great Arnauld, doctor of the Sorbonne and champion of the Jansenists. She had introduced to her brothers her friend St. Francis de Sales, and after his death her eldest brother introduced her to St. Cyran, who became henceforth the spiritual director of Port Royal. The men who came under St. Cyran's influence retired as recluses to the Convent des Champs, where they devoted themselves to study and the education of youth. Among these recluses were Pascal and Arnauld, Le Maître and Nicole, Lancelot, De Sacy and Fontaine. The names also of Tillemont and Racine are associated with the seclusion of Port Royal.

This powerful abbey was extending its influence over all France. It had now grown rich in temporal goods as well as in the moral and spiritual wealth of its members. It educated the children of the nobility. It provided schools for the poor. It distributed the Holy Scriptures, and it employed physicians to heal the sick. But the sting of all was that from within these walls came forth the terrible 'Provincial Letters' of Blaise Pascal. The Jesuits had no resource but to take vengeance by physical force. While the matter of the Pope's infallibility in matters of fact was under discussion the Duke of Lioncourt was refused absolution by a priest of St. Sulpice if he did not remove his

grand-daughter from the school of Port Royal. Arnould wrote two letters in defence of the Jansenists. The propositions extracted from these letters were condemned by the theological faculty of Paris, and Arnould was excluded from the Sorbonne. With the condemnation of the Jansenists came the greatest trials of Port Royal. In 1660 the Archbishop of Toulouse prepared a formulary which declared that the five propositions were in Jansen as the Pope had decreed, and that they were not the doctrine of Augustine. This formulary was to be subscribed not only by the clergy, but by all schoolmasters, and all members of religious houses, even by nuns. The Jansenists unanimously refused to subscribe. The novices and scholars were immediately expelled. The directors and confessors were banished. Both houses were visited by a troop of horse under the direction of the lieutenant of police, and such of the recluses as were able fled for their lives. The Mère Angelique had now reached threescore and ten, and had braved a persecution of five-and-twenty years. She had spent the winter at Port Royal des Champs in feeble health, suffering from age and infirmity. But old and afflicted as she was, she judged that when the hour of trial came her presence would be most required at Port Royal de Paris. Before her departure she assembled the whole community of Port Royal des Champs. She exhorted them to be constant, instructed them how to act in the approaching crisis, charged them to be faithful to the end, and with a steadfast tenderness she took her final leave, telling them that they would see her face no more. As her brother Arnould d'Andilly

helped her into the carriage she said, 'Farewell, brother,' 'be of good cheer.' D'Andilly answered, 'Never fear, sister, my courage is perfectly firm and undismayed.' She replied, 'My dear brother, let us be humble, let us remember that if humility without constancy is vilely casting away the impenetrable shield of faith, that courage without deep self-distrust is that ungodly presumption and pride which cometh before a fall.' She reached Paris in time to see the scholars and the novices dispersed. A few weeks later she was on her death-bed, surrounded by her weeping nuns. With many pious words she exhorted them to be steadfast, calmly telling them that her earthly work was done, and that eternity was at hand.

The Bastille was soon filled with Jansenists. Four bishops, who refused to subscribe the formulary of the Archbishop of Toulouse, were condemned by a Papal brief, sent forth by Alexander VII. when he lay on his death-bed. The next Pope, Clement IX., made peace with the Jansenists. He was satisfied with the subscription, which simply declared that the five propositions were heretical, without reference to their being either in Jansen or Augustine. For a time persecution ceased; Jansenists were not considered heretics by the authorities of the Church. The schools of Port Royal again flourished, and the Scriptures were busily circulated in France. This continued from 1668 to 1679. In the last year the Duchess of Longueville died. She had protected Port Royal from the displeasure of the King. In the same year Pope Innocent XI. condemned sixty-four propositions in the authoritative writings of the

Jesuits. In the examination of these writings great use had been made of what had been written against them by Arnauld and Nicole. The Jesuits retaliated by procuring an order from the King that the recluses should quit the valley of Port Royal at once and for ever. The nuns were forbidden to receive scholars or novices. The Jansenists were scattered. The Edict of Nantes, which gave liberty to Protestants, was revoked. Fenelon was banished. The power of the Pope was restrained, and the Jesuits ruled France. Quesnel's 'Reflexions Morales' was condemned. De Naoilles, when Bishop of Chalons, had recommended this book to his clergy, but, as Archbishop of Paris and servant of the King and the Jesuits, he wrote its condemnation.

In 1707 Clement XI. issued another Bull against the Jansenists. The nuns refused to receive it, and in 1708 a Bull came for the entire suppression of the convent. The Abbess was kept in confinement at Blois, where she died, after six years' captivity. The Bishop of Blois refused her the last sacrament, unless she would renounce the doctrines of Jansen. She replied that she had made her peace through the blood of the cross, and besought the Bishop, with many tears, to give her the last office of the Church. He reviled her for a heretic; and she, at length taking courage, and wiping away her tears, answered, 'Well, my lord, I am content to bear with resignation whatever deprivation my God sees meet. I am convinced that His divine grace can supply even the want of sacraments.'

In 1709 the cloister of Port Royal was destroyed.

In 1711 the bodies were cast out of the burying-ground. In 1713 the church was razed to the ground, and the site of the centre buildings was ploughed as a field, that no stone might be left to mark the place where they stood. The Archbishop of Paris, who had issued the decree, went to see it executed, and as the walls were thrown down he exclaimed, 'O God, these dismantled stones shall rise against me in the day of judgment.'

The rest of the nuns were imprisoned in other monasteries, and treated as heretics. Quesnel and the leading Jansenists fled to Holland. Their doctrines were so well received that by the end of the seventeenth century the Roman Catholics of Holland were generally reckoned Jansenists. Under a Protestant Government the Jesuits could not raise a persecution. Their only chance was to bring the bishops of Holland into collision with the Pope, and so get the Roman Catholics of Holland immediately under the government of the Roman Curia. It was this scheme which has brought the Church of Utrecht into its present position. The see of Utrecht was founded in 696 by Willibrord, an English missionary. The bishop was a suffragan of the Archbishop of Cologne. At the Reformation it was found that Protestantism made most progress where the dioceses were large. For this reason Pope Paul IV. created Utrecht an archbishopric, with four suffragans. After the seven united provinces threw off the yoke of Spain, the Archbishops of Utrecht, under other names, exercised their authority over the Roman Catholics of Holland; but the suffragans ceased to be appointed.

The Jesuits wished to be independent of the archbishops. They said that they were direct missionaries from the Pope, and under the government of the general of their order. During the episcopate of M. de Neercassel the Jansenists came into Holland. Arnauld, after his expulsion from the Sorbonne, found a refuge in the diocese of Utrecht. This archbishop died in 1686. The chapter of Utrecht, with that of Haarlem, appointed as his successor M. Van Heussen. But the appointment was not confirmed at Rome. The Jesuits wished an archbishop of their own choosing. The chapters reassembled, and forwarded to the Pope the names of three others. The Pope chose M. Codde, who was consecrated with the title of Archbishop of Sebastè. He was found to favour the Jansenists; but as he could not be condemned without a trial, he was invited to Rome. When there he was treated with great tenderness, and kept in confinement for three years, till his case could be investigated *in a friendly way*. In the meantime the Pope appointed Theodore de Cock Vicar Apostolic in Holland. But Archbishop Codde made his escape from Rome, and returned to his diocese.

The scheme succeeded. During these three years the Jesuits had made a party who were opposed to the Jansenist prelates. Archbishop Codde, supposing that he personally was the object of the Jesuits' hatred, retired from the archbishopric, allowing the chapters to govern the see by vicars-apostolic. But the Papal nuncio at Cologne claimed that he had a commission from the Pope to govern Utrecht. Archbishop Codde died in 1710. The chapters continued

to appoint vicars-apostolic. In 1719, failing to be heard at Rome, they appealed to the next General Council that should be held. In 1721 they wrote to Innocent XIII., requesting that no difficulties might be thrown in the way of their choosing an archbishop. They received no answer. They wrote again in 1722, but still received no answer. In 1723 they elected as their archbishop Cornelius Steenhoven. They applied to the Pope for confirmation; but their letters were unnoticed. They sent a circular letter to all the neighbouring bishops, on whom the responsibility of consecration devolved, in accordance with the ancient canons. At the same time the internuncio at Brussels issued an inhibition absolutely forbidding the neighbouring bishops to take part in the consecration. There was but one resource left. Dominic Varlet, Bishop of Babylon, *in partibus*, who had been deposed for Jansenism, had taken refuge in Holland. In 1724 Varlet consecrated Steenhoven. A notification was sent to the Pope, which his Holiness answered by anathemas and briefs of excommunication. Steenhoven died next year, and was succeeded by Archbishop Barchman, who was also consecrated by the Bishop of Babylon. A brief of condemnation was the only notice received from Rome. The Archbishop and his consecrator, with the clergy of Utrecht, appealed against the Bull *Unigenitus* by which Quesnel had been condemned. Barchman was succeeded by Van der Coon, and in 1739 Archbishop Meinwaarts was consecrated also by the Bishop of Babylon. He restored two of the suffragan sees, Haarlem and Deveneter. By means

of the bishops of these sees the succession has been preserved. The consecrations have always been followed by Papal excommunications.

Dr. Tregelles* gives an interesting account of an interview which he had in 1850 with Van Santen, Archbishop of the Old Catholics of Holland. The Archbishop told him that they did not acknowledge the name of Jansenist, but they did not consider that it implies any reproach. They regard themselves as holding the doctrines of the Catholic Church as set forth in the writings of St. Augustine, and which the Church of Rome once maintained in opposition to Pelagian and semi-Pelagian errors. The whole of the Archbishop's conversation savoured of the theology of Calvin. Grace, *efficacious* grace, were his favourite words. By this he said the glory of salvation belongs to God only. He gave an account of an effort which the Pope had made in 1827 to get the Old Catholics of Holland to subscribe the formulary which declares the five propositions to be in Jansen, and to receive the Bull *Unigenitus*. Cappucini, the Papal nuncio, invited the Archbishop to a conference, and explained how he might subscribe the formulary as a mere *form*. The Archbishop answered that he had more than once read the 'Augustinus.' He was convinced that the five propositions were not there, and he could not subscribe what he knew to be false. 'The Pope, and the whole Church,' he added, 'cannot alter a matter of fact.' 'But,' said the nuncio, 'a child is bound to believe his parent. If a parent says that a piece of green cloth is red, the child has no right

* "The Jansenists," by S. P. Tregelles, LL.D.

to believe his own eyes.' The nuncio inculcated the duty of implicit obedience to the 'Holy Father,' and the Archbishop used his own judgment. Thus the Church of Utrecht continues holding fast, as it says, to the unity of the Catholic Church, till the Pope is brought to reason. It is an odd unity certainly. But their plea is that for whatever disunion exists the Papal Court is responsible. The Archbishop told Dr. Tregelles that he did not believe there would be a really united Christian Church till the coming of Elijah and the conversion of the Jews as a nation. Then Jesus Christ would be glorified *on the earth*, and reign on the throne of His father David.

There is much in the Church of Utrecht to interest all Protestants. At the present time it is brought into prominent notice through its possession of Episcopal order. To some persons this is the part of least importance. But in estimating movements among Roman Catholics we must try to look at them from their stand-point as well as from our own. The Old Catholics of Bavaria believe in the necessity of Episcopal offices. It is not to be expected that they can all at once change their views on every point. But there are symptoms, both in Bavaria and Utrecht, that mere Episcopacy is regarded as a very subordinate matter. Döllinger's sympathies ostensibly are with English High Churchmen, Irvingites, and other hierarchical sects, but in reality his views are wider and deeper. It is not too much to hope that after renouncing Papal infallibility the Old Catholics will see the futility of trying to establish Christianity on the authority of a visible Catholic Church.

XV.

THE OLD CATHOLIC CONGRESS.

THE Old Catholic movement was of sufficient interest to induce me this year to postpone my annual holiday till September. The second Congress was appointed to be held in the ancient city of Cologne. I was there in the beginning of the month, and was able to spend a fortnight in the Rhine district before the time of the Congress. This fortnight was chiefly employed in conversing with different classes of people about the prospects of the movement. I found it everywhere the chief subject of interest. The Protestants were watching it carefully, not at all sanguine of its success, and rather doubtful what judgment they should pass upon it. The Ultramontane Catholics confidently predicted its speedy annihilation. But the Old Catholics, many of whom I met accidentally in hotels and other places, were enthusiastic in their work, and spoke of their victory as certain.

In the beginning of the week in which the Congress was to be held I returned to Bonn. I had a

card of introduction to Professor Knoodt, which I presented on the Tuesday morning. The servant told me that the Professor was in conference with several gentlemen who had come to attend the Congress. Fearing any intrusion, I sent in the cards, saying that I would call again when it would be convenient for the Professor to see me. I had not waited a second when a door opened. The Professor embraced me with both hands, and reading my name from the card introduced me to the company as 'An Anglican Clergyman from London.' All present rose to their feet to receive me. It was a few seconds before I learned all their names, and I waited a minute to breathe before I could realise the fact that I was in the presence of the chief leaders of the Old Catholic movement. At one end of the table sat Professor Von Shulte, and at the other Professor Rheinkens. Beside Shulte was Professor Michelis, of Braunsberg, with Professors Rensch and Langen, of Bonn. On one side of Rheinkens was Professor Huber, from Munich, and on the other side Professor Maasen, from Prague, and the Abbé Michaud, late Vicar of the Madeleine in Paris. We had a second meeting in the afternoon, when we were joined by the Russian deputation, which consisted of the High Priest, Johann Janyshew, from St. Petersburg, and Alexander Kirejew, Aide-de-Camp to the Grand Duke Constantine. Janyshew is also Director of the Academy in St. Petersburg, and has some reputation as a metaphysician. He spoke several times at the different meetings during the Congress, and always with great wisdom and earnestness. Kirejew, though a military

man, takes a great interest in all religious matters, and is Secretary of an important Society called 'The Society of the Friends of Religious Enlightenment' (*Geistlicher Aufklärung*). During the sitting Professor Friedrich arrived from Munich, accompanied by Pastor Kühn, from the Rheinfalls. Soon after a telegram was received that the Bishop of Lincoln would arrive at Bonn by the ten o'clock train next morning. The conversations at these preparatory meetings were all of course private. They revealed what, however, was sufficiently manifest at the public assemblies, that there are great varieties of opinion among the Old Catholic leaders.

It had been agreed that we should all meet the Bishop of Lincoln at the railway station on his arrival at Bonn. I was there perhaps the first. But soon after, I found Dr. Döllinger, who had arrived the night before, taking a solitary walk under the chestnut trees that adjoin the station. He looked much older than when I saw him last year in Munich, and his strength is evidently not what it was. On returning towards the station we met Friedrich, and by ten o'clock a considerable company had gathered on the platform. We received the Bishop with all the respect which is due to his office, and he received us with all the amiable courtesy which marks his character. The meetings at Professor Knoodt's house on the second day took a different turn from those of the first day; the German language gave place to the French, and the chief speakers were the Bishop and Dr. Döllinger, with an occasional address from Von Shulte. There was an interesting conversation between Dr. Döllinger

and Dr. Wordsworth, on the nature of the Sacrament of the Supper. This arose out of an announcement that part of the proceedings at Cologne was to be a holy mass in St. Pantaleon's Church. It is not revealing any secret to say that the Bishop took a clear and decidedly Protestant view, such as became a dignity of the Reformed Church of England. Another change which the Bishop introduced, was, to begin the meeting with prayer for the divine guidance. Of his exhortations, I may have occasion to speak again. They all turned on the Catholicity of the English Church, and the necessity of adhering to the doctrine and discipline of the first ages of Christianity, as the Church of England had ever done. At the close of this conference, he distributed copies of our Prayer-Book in the German language, begging that the members of the Congress might read them, and see for themselves that our doctrine and discipline were Apostolic, Primitive, and Catholic. Before the afternoon sitting, a Professor came to me with a Prayer-Book in his hand. 'I will give you,' he said, 'my opinion. Your Prayer-Book consists of three parts. It is part Catholic, part Lutheran, and part Calvinistic. The prayers are from the old Catholic Church; the doctrine of the Eucharist (Articles XXVIII. and XXIX.) is Lutheran, and the other doctrines (Articles IX. to XVIII.), are from John Calvin.' Another Professor read over Articles XXVIII. and XXIX. 'That,' he said, 'is not Luther's doctrine; it is also from Calvin. The whole of these Articles are Calvinistic.' He then quoted passages from Calvin on the Eucharist, which corresponded with the language of

our Articles. He also quoted passages from Luther, which did not correspond with what the Articles said. With this Professor I quite agreed. I have always maintained that our doctrine of the Eucharist, as well as all our other doctrines, are taken, not from Luther, but from Calvin.

Our next meeting was in Cologne, on the Thursday evening, in the *Wiener Hof*. The object of this meeting was to welcome the guests. The most prominent of these were, the Archbishop of Utrecht, the Bishop of Lincoln, the Bishop of Ely, the Bishop of Maryland, and the Dean of Westminster, with the representatives of the Russian Church. Père Hyacinthe was also present, but he did not speak at any of the meetings. His recent marriage has put him a step beyond the most advanced leaders of the Old Catholic movement. The President was the Chief Councillor Wülffing, who spoke of the great progress the movement had made since last year. All the bishops made speeches, and an American clergyman, long resident in Florence, brought salutations from many Italian Catholics, who were prevented attending the Congress by political circumstances.

In the early morning of Friday, I was present at a mass in the Council House Chapel, which has been given to the Old Catholics by the Burgomeister of Cologne. The officiating priest was Dr. Tangemann, who also delivered an address suitable to the occasion. By half-past seven, the little chapel was densely crowded, and many were unable to obtain admission. The service was the mass pure and simple, with the bowings, the crossings, the bell-rings, all without

change. This was the prelude to the day's proceedings. Here were assembled for early prayer most of the Old Catholic leaders, and many devout laymen. At nine o'clock, we were in the great hall of the Gürzenich for the first meeting of the delegates. The Gürzenich is an old town building, which has been recently restored, and is generally used for concerts, and other great public meetings. It seemed to be associated in the mind of every inhabitant of Cologne, with the masked balls in the time of the Carnival before Lent. Through the attention of Professor Huber, I was provided with the chief seat at one of the reporters' tables. Professor Von Shulte was voted to the chair. This choice was unanimous. It was not necessary to see more than I had seen at Bonn, to know that Shulte had won his way to a high place among the leaders of the Old Catholic movement. His calm clear intellect, his readiness of speech, and his lawyer-like capacity for business, marked him out at once as the most eligible man to be President of the Congress. Shulte is Professor of Canon Law at Prague, and bears some personal resemblance to Bismarck. The business administration of the Congress was admirable. There was free discussion, but under fixed laws; and the President showed wonderful capacity in keeping the speakers to the laws, and preventing the introduction of questions for the discussion of which the proper time had not yet come. After a few words from the Archbishop of Utrecht, who seems to be a simple-minded, pious man, the Bishop of Lincoln read a Latin oration, several printed copies of which were distributed among the delegates. The scope of it was a justification of the

English Reformation on Catholic principles. We kept to primitive doctrine and discipline. We did not make a schism, but the Bishop of Rome thrust us out from communion with him, and we have had to endure a schism. The bishops now in communion with Rome were compared to the bishops in the time of the Arians. They are valid bishops, but tainted with heresy. The Old Catholics were exhorted to come out of the Church of Rome, that they 'be not partakers of her sins, and receive not of her plagues.' This, however, was accompanied with admonitions to caution, and not rashly to invade dioceses already assigned to other bishops.

After the Bishop of Lincoln's address, Professor Reusch entered on an examination of the resolutions which constituted the first part of the programme. These related to the immediate action of the Old Catholics as a community. Their policy is to make no changes at present, but to maintain their position as Old Catholics, agreeing with the Catholic Church before the Vatican decree of July, 1870. The necessity, however, for reform was not ignored, and many of the speakers spoke out with a boldness and a decision that would have delighted the most Protestant heart in England. In the programme itself special mention was made of the necessity of reform in the selling of masses, the abuse of indulgences, the worship of saints, the scapulary, medallions, &c. In the course of the discussions, some other things were mentioned as demanding reformation, as soon as it could be legally effected. Prominent among these was the whole system of confession and the enforced celibacy of the

clergy. The resolutions, with some unimportant changes, were all agreed to. One of them was the appointing of a committee of canonists and theologians to elect a bishop for the Old Catholic community. The other subjects discussed at the meeting of the delegates, were the re-union of the separated Churches of Christendom, and the rights of the Old Catholics as against the State and the Vatican Church.

The first public meeting was on Saturday afternoon, when the speeches were of a more popular character. The immense hall of the Gürzenich was densely crowded. It required but a glance at the bright intelligent faces of the men and the women who constituted that assembly, to see that no small part of the Catholic intellect of Cologne was on the side of the Old Catholics. The Bishop of Ely, in a brief but judicious address, made clear the ground on which the Church of England stood in relation to the movement. We had come to express our sympathy, and as far as in us lay to give our help, but we had not come to dictate or to interfere. This was the tone of the Bishop's speech. He was followed by Professor Huber, a little dark fiery man, whose words are sharp arrows. Huber recounted the successes which the movement had met since the congress of last year. He spoke thankfully of the expulsion of the Jesuits, whom he regards with the same feelings of distrust and antipathy which we find in an English Dissenter or an Irish Orangeman. This was followed by lusty bravos from the assembly, whose love to the Jesuits was evidently a love that wished

them far away from the German Fatherland. Huber also spoke some noble words on the necessity of reform. The infallibility dogma was but the starting-point for reformation. It was itself the culmination of a false hierarchical principle, the outcome of a corrupt development, that has been at work for more than a thousand years. External authority, he said, has now placed itself in sharp opposition to conscience and thought. The words of Jesus were spirit and life, but for these the Church of Rome has substituted a mechanical hierarchy and the reign of death. Professor Knoodt followed. The Pope, he said, decreed infallibility and the Council gave their consent. The only argument the Pope could use was, 'I say I am infallible—therefore I am infallible.' The Professor believed that God's Spirit guided the Church, but that Spirit only helped those who helped themselves. Divine guidance was not given to men who disregard written revelation, who despise reason, and wage war with the mental and moral progress of the human race. In the Arabian Gospel there is a passage where Jesus says that He could heal the sick and raise the dead, but one thing He could not do, He could not put brains into a fool's head. Professor Michelis spoke of the influence of scholastic philosophy which was still in the way of progress. Thomas Aquinas as well as the Jesuits must be banished from the Catholic Church in Germany. Scholasticism took shelter under the great name of Aristotle, but it was really built on a very incorrect Arabian translation of Aristotle's philosophy. Michelis, perhaps the most ardent apostle of the cause, is a man of prodigious

physical strength, and when he speaks it is with the ardour and vehemence of a Demosthenes.

The Sunday was a strange Sunday for an Englishman, not to say an English clergyman, but there were circumstances which authorised a departure from English customs. It was part of the arrangements of the English bishops to have daily services in the Temple House, and not to attend the religious services of the Old Catholics. It would justly have been a scandal for an English bishop, under any circumstances, to have been present at the celebration of a mass. The day began well. Of its ending I shall have to speak again. At half-past seven, we had an early communion in the side chapel of the church of St. Pantaleon. Here in the early morning many English laymen of different classes, clergymen of all ranks and representatives of all parties, had assembled in a Catholic chapel to celebrate the English communion. At that moment our own differences seemed forgotten and an important step taken towards union with those who are not visibly one with us.

This service was scarcely concluded, when the people were streaming into the church of St. Pantaleon for the nine o'clock mass, which was part of the programme of the Congress. It was calculated that not less than three thousand people were present at this service. The mass was musical, the grand C major bass of Beethoven was exquisitely performed by an accomplished choir. The sermon was preached by Dr. Tangermann, the Old Catholic pastor of Cologne. Tangermann is a priest of whom any Church might be proud; calm, thoughtful, poetical, and in the pulpit a

tongue of fire. Under the name of Victor Granella, he has published a small volume of patriotic songs,* full of love for Fatherland and hatred for the Italian usurpation over the German Church. In one of these poems, on the Vatican Council, he expresses in epigrammatic words the different tone of the Ultramontane and the German intellect. While the German meditates a calm solution of the difficult problems of our time, the Vatican, despising all past experience, solves them by enforcing a new dogma. An anathema is sufficient to overcome all difficulties, but, alas! the poet says, the problems remain where they were. Tangermann was formerly Pfarrer of Unkel, a small parish in the neighbourhood of Bingen. He refused submission, and was excommunicated by the Archbishop of Cologne. In two sermons which he preached in the church of Unkel, on 'Peter and Paul,' he sets aside the external hierarchy as not of the essence of the Church, which is built, not on Peter, but on the truth which Peter confessed. The same doctrine runs through some other sermons and pamphlets, where the Church is defined, not as the bishops and priests, but the faithful people. It is the living kingdom of God in the hearts of men. To this kingdom the Roman hierarchy is now opposed, and is striving to substitute darkness for light. The sermon on Sunday morning was on the essential living essence of the Christian religion, and the war now being waged in its defence on the banks of the Rhine. With the eloquent ardour of a Christian patriot, the preacher prayed for the divine blessing on the Protes-

* 'Patriotische Lieder und Zeitgedichte.' Cohen and Son, Bonn.

tant rulers of Germany, and for divine strength and guidance in the present warfare against ignorance and superstition.

The second public meeting was also in the Great Hall of the Gürzenich, on Sunday afternoon at five o'clock. An hour before the time the people were pouring into the building, which was, if possible, even more densely crowded than on the day before. The chief speakers were Professors Friedrich, Maasen, Reinkens, and Von Shulte. Friedrich is the youngest of all the leaders. He has not seen more than six and thirty summers. But, as he said in his speech, though still young, he has lived much, perhaps too much. As theologian to Cardinal Hohenlohe, he attended the Vatican Council. He is an eminent scholar, and has written several important works in theology and history. In an outburst of enthusiasm he thanked God that his lot was cast in these days, when the empire was being restored and the Church reformed. Friedrich is a universal favourite. This is visible in the very way in which everybody mentions his name, in the way that others cluster round him wherever he is seen, and in the rapturous salutations which he receives when he rises to speak. There is a softness in his features and a vivacity in his countenance which recall the portraits of Schiller. He said many things which indicated that he is prepared to go very far in the way of reform. The necessity for this did not begin with the Vatican decree. It was older by many centuries. We contend, Friedrich said, not merely against Papal infallibility, but against the whole Papal system, against the errors that have been accu-

mulating for a thousand years. We come back to the ground on which our Lord and Master stood. We do not want so many things interposed between us and Christ. He spoke of the Old Catholic movement as having already made greater progress than the Reformation did in the same time. He advocated the abolition of the Confessional and the Religious Orders, with the ultimate, but not immediate, removal of celibacy, and he wished to have the service of God in the language of the people. Professor Maasen is a cautious but sure reformer. Like Shulte he has a lawyer's brain, and steadfastly insists on first securing the civil rights of the Old Catholics. When this is done he believes that many of the other priests will join them. The Vatican Church, he said, is not the true Church. Christ's Church is not constituted by Popes and Bishops and Clergy, but by the true doctrine of Jesus Christ.

The great speech of the evening was that of Professor Reinkens, from Breslau. Reinkens is a tower of strength to the Old Catholic cause. His views are fixed and clear. He is a ready and fluent speaker, mingling with his speech a continual stream of good-natured sarcasm. He is genial and humorous, with a benignant smile perpetually on his face. The Old Catholic movement he compared to a river. The fountain is opened by conscience. Its content is faith in the light of eternal truth, its moving power is moral freedom and reason. This is a German way of speaking which must not frighten us. None of the Old Catholic leaders has declared more clearly than Professor Reinkens that Christ's gospel is a power in

the hearts of men, that the Church is not an outward kingdom, not a visible hierarchy, but that it consists of those who are called to eternal life. In this speech he enumerated the hindrances which prevent the kingdom of God coming into the hearts of the Catholic millions. They look for it in some visible authority, but Christ says it is 'within you.' They are told to hear mass, to receive sacraments, to pay according to order, to keep fasts, to believe miracles, and then they will be justified. In Christianity, religion is a life, but with the multitude of Catholics it is a mere performance of prescribed ceremonies. Religion is measured by the number of prayers repeated. Christ made the highest commandment, love to God and our neighbour, but the Ultramontane Church makes it the highest act of faith to think as the Pope thinks. Another hindrance is the power of the priests over women in the confessional. Thousands of upright women, who regard the priest as standing in the place of God, obey him in everything, and thereby break the peace of their families. A third hindrance is the difficulty of providing for the priests who leave the Vatican Church. A fourth is indifference to truth. The Church is fruitful in dogmas. It has so many that all the bishops in Germany could not tell how many there are. The Bishop of Breslau complained to the speaker that at Rome he had placed before him a whole volume of scholastic formulas to be received as dogmas. The Pope is the interpreter of Scripture. The Pope is tradition. Whether or not he agrees with the Fathers is altogether unimportant. Another great hindrance is the conduct of the opposition bishops. They had

declared in their dioceses that the new dogma was the destruction of souls, and now they enforce it as necessary for eternal salvation.

I almost tremble to record how the Sunday evening was spent. The public meeting ended about nine o'clock, when two hundred of the delegates adjourned to a casino for a banquet. I was the only Englishman present, and I waited to see the last of it. Anything more incompatible with English ideas of Sunday it is impossible to conceive. Toasts were drunk and glasses rattled against glasses while two hundred strong-lunged Germans shouted in chorus, 'Hoch, hoch, hurra!' for Bismarck, for Döllinger, for Shulte, and others in succession. I should probably not have attended this banquet but for some Crefeld merchants whom I met at my hotel. When I returned to the *table d'hôte* after the English service, I found a great company of about fifty persons making the usual obstreperous commotion which the Germans think a necessary accompaniment to a comfortable dinner. I soon discovered that they were delegates to the Congress. I had been seen in the Gürzenich and our friendship was immediate. They asked how I was to spend the evening after the meeting was over. There was, they said, something very good at the theatre, would I be one of a party to go there? I told them that in England we did not go to theatres on Sunday. I expressed my inability to understand how men who in the morning had been to such a solemn religious service as they regarded the mass to be, could find pleasure in the theatre on the evening of the same day. The impressions produced in the church

would in my judgment be effaced by the excitement of the theatre. The men laughed at my idea as if I had said something singular. Their wives, however, seemed to feel that there was some truth in what I said. 'You are right, Herr Pastor,' cried one lady from the other side of the room. 'You are right. We have far too much noise on Sunday, too much theatre going, and too much public-house going, but our priests have not taught us any better.' I said that I had conversed with many of the priests on that subject, and though they did not see their way to break in upon present customs, yet there was a general desire among them to see a better observance of Sunday, as a day of rest and worship. This is really the case with some of the most Ultramontane. I declined to go to the theatre, but I agreed to attend the banquet, which was really a part of the proceedings of the Congress. On our way to the Gürzenich, after dinner, my friends proposed a visit to a café. This place was full of people drinking beer and coffee and playing cards. My lessons as yet had but little effect. A gentleman took a pack of cards from his pocket, and addressing me as Herr Pastor, asked if he would have the pleasure of a game with me. 'No, my friend,' I said. 'No, I have come here purely to see how you spend your Sunday, but to play cards with you is too much.' I intimated the probable presence of an individual who was so troublesome to Luther that the Reformer once aimed an inkstand at his head.

I have never seen the customs of the two countries come so thoroughly in collision as during the meet-

ings of this Congress. In our first meeting at Bonn, the hospitable Professor supplied us with wine, beer, and cigars. On the second day, when the Bishop of Lincoln was reading his Latin prayers, the servant came into the room with the glasses rattling ; but the moment was inopportune, and the conversation followed with such unceasing earnestness that the wine and the beer never found an entrance. In the afternoon, however, the Professor's generous heart was in anticipation of business. The table was prepared. We all took our cigars. The box was duly presented to the Bishop, but his Lordship thrust it from him in a way that left no doubt of the measure of his appreciation of a cigar box. Every one waited for his neighbour to light first, but no man took the lead, and the Bishop's triumph was complete. Next evening, however, in the *Wiener Hof* in Cologne, Teutonic customs prevailed. The guests were received in true German fashion, and the bishops had to make their speeches amid the rattling of plates and glasses and dark surging clouds of tobacco smoke. While the Bishop of Lincoln was discoursing in the French language on the necessity of bishops, priests, and deacons, a hotel waiter was justling aside the Dean of Westminster, to convey beefsteaks and Brauenberger to a German Professor. I told the waiter to wait a minute till the Bishop had finished, but he was only restrained by the strong arm of Professor Michelis, who at the time was standing beside me. It must have been an immense joy to the Bishop of Lincoln, as he entered the Gürzenich next morning, to find notices all over the building that smoking was

strictly forbidden. The custom is in no way, I suppose, incompatible with religion, but the Germans have no conception how droll to an English assembly would have been the scene at the evening banquet. The Venerable Archbishop of Utrecht, with one of his canons, sat in a prominent place, provided with the interminable cigar, and participating in the boisterous hilarity of the evening. The Bishop of Lincoln absented himself from all the Sunday meetings of the Old Catholics, a plain intimation that in his judgment they must reform their Sunday as well as their mass.

The conduct of the English bishops and clergy throughout the whole proceedings was commendable. Those who went to mass did so as spectators, with the exception of perhaps not more than two Ritualists, who tried to show their acquaintance with Catholic crossings, bowings, and genuflexions. The Bishop of Ely was very unobtrusive, and seemed anxious to appear, not so much as a bishop, but as plain Dr. Harold Browne. The presence of the Bishop of Lincoln was a great good. His visit to the Cologne Congress is one of the best acts of his life. I am far from agreeing with the position he took up, but the genuineness and earnestness of his character impressed all who were present, and amply condoned for the want of logic in his arguments, and a little Episcopal mannerism, which, however, is quite in keeping with his views of the office of a bishop. The sight of the crozier at the morning communion was a little amusing. It was perhaps profane at an English service in a Catholic chapel, to be thinking of a Methodist hymn, but there is one that says:—

‘ With my pastoral crook,
I went over the brook.’

One of our greatest duties in the present day, I was going to say, is to let the bishops have their way.

‘ Why should kings and nobles have
Pictured trophies to their grave,
And we, churls, to thee deny
Thy *pretty toys* ? ’

I heard the Bishop’s sermon on Sunday morning in the Temple House, but I would rather not criticize it. He spoke strongly on the necessity of separating from bishops who do not hold the truth, and he reflected on John Wesley for disregarding the Episcopal order, and consecrating bishops for America. But Wesley, from his own stand-point, simply followed the course recommended by the Bishop. There was no Episcopate in America, and after the revolution there were no clergy. He could not prevail on the English bishops to ordain some of his preachers who were willing to go to America, and he saw no prospect of a church being established according to the order of the Church of England. If a certain order is absolutely a part of Christianity, there can be no circumstances in which that order can be set aside.

Shulte, referring to the Bishop of Lincoln’s speech, said that he had been reproached with allowing attacks on the Catholic religion. The real meaning of these words I was never able to learn. Everybody had a different version and a different interpretation. It was even said that Döllinger was greatly offended with the address; but my own opinion is, that Shulte’s

words were taken for a great deal more than they were intended. I asked a Bonn Professor, whom I met in the Arcade on Monday morning, what was the point to which exception was taken? He said he did not know. I asked if the Bishop's speech was too Protestant, and he answered, no, it was not Protestant enough. 'Do you really,' I added, 'go as far from the Vatican Church as the Bishop of Lincoln?' 'We go further,' was the answer. I believe this. The Bishop of Lincoln's stand-point is the same in kind as the authority which the Old Catholics are rejecting. Another Professor said that the Bishop's address was only a bit of Puseyism. I corrected this. It was not quite Puseyism. There is no fear of the Old Catholics substituting Episcopal authority in the place of the authority of the Pope. They are not likely to join the simple people in England who talk of the re-union of Episcopal Churches as the re-union of Christendom. The same door which is opened to receive the English bishops, will admit the German Protestant and the English Dissenter.

The interest which this Congress excited in Cologne was compared by some of the people to the excitement of the war with France. On the following Monday I strolled through the streets, and had many unexpected proofs of the interest which the townspeople took in the Congress. If I went into a shop to buy anything, the Old Catholic movement was certain to be the subject of conversation. If I stood at the end of a street, I was sure to be saluted by some ardent Old Catholic who had seen me in the Gürzenich. 'I was born a Catholic,' said a respectable merchant to

me, 'and I mean to die a Catholic. Not three months ago I baptized my child myself, rather than have it baptized by an Ultramontane priest.' Another man, who held a responsible situation in the post office, told me that the priest of the parish where his parents lived taught him when a boy that Protestants would be saved as well as Catholics; but now he said the Syllabus sets forth that only those who belong to the Catholic Church can be saved. I told him that the primary difference between a Catholic and a Protestant was, that the one obeyed, and the other reasoned. By ceasing to believe what the authorities of the Church decreed, he ceased to be a Catholic. He did not want to be reasoned out of his Catholicism. 'I am a Catholic,' he said, with emphasis; then standing for a moment, and pointing to one of the impure puddles which still adorn the ancient city of Cologne, he added, 'God has given me reason as a gift, to be used and not to be thrust into the gutter.' In the afternoon I was walking down a narrow street in a poor part of the town, when an old man with a basket on his back came towards me smiling. I thought at first that he might be begging, but he took off his hat, and addressing me as *Mein Herr*, he said, 'I saw you in our Congress. We'll beat the Ultramontanes.' He then called to his wife who was standing at the door, 'Here is an English pastor come to help us to beat our Ultramontanes.' His wife came, and some of the neighbours came, till a little company was collected. A young priest passed at the time, who politely took off his hat to me, and looked as if he wanted to know what was the matter. 'I

am an Old Catholic,' cried the old man; 'my wife is an Old Catholic; we are all Old Catholics.' The priest smiled and passed on. Soon after I walked away, but was followed by an intelligent seafaring man, who had been in England, and wished to give me his opinion of the Congress. He was a zealous Old Catholic, and spoke with enthusiasm of the certainty of success. When I left my hotel, the Crefeld ladies cried, 'Adieu, Herr Pastor. Give our *Gruss* (greeting) to England, and our thanks to the English bishops for coming to our Congress.'

As I wished to hear all sides that I might form an impartial estimate, during my wanderings in the Rhine district I visited the Jesuit Fathers in the cloister of Bornhoffen. As an English clergyman I was received by them with great politeness. Two of the priests entered into conversation with me on the religious questions that are now agitating Germany. They managed the conversation with great tact, and spoke freely without any apparent reserve. One of them quoted in Latin the words of Jesus, that we must become as little children, which he interpreted as inculcating submission to the authority of the Church. The cause of all heresy and of all religious dissension he found in the pride of the human intellect. Of the Old Catholic movement, he said, 'I give it three years to continue, and then it will be as little heard of as the once famous movement of Johann Ronge.' 'It is strong,' he added, 'among the wealthy, the educated, and in the journals; but the leaders have no humility, and the people are mostly those who have been long indifferent about religion.' I thought it probable that

there might be a difference as to the sense in which the word religion was used. I intimated that, perhaps, those who were called indifferent, might not be indifferent to religion, but only to certain prescribed ceremonies which went under the name of religion. The ignorant liked rites and shows, the educated did not. 'Then,' said the priest, 'we must have two religions, one for the educated, and one for the uneducated.' The problem was manifest, but we did not attempt a solution. The fact was confessed that Catholics depart from Catholicism as understood by the Ultramontanes, just in the degree that they become educated. I mentioned a conclusion to which I had come from my study of the religious history of Germany, which is that, but for the Jesuits, Germany would have been lost to Catholicism, and that they have done for the Catholic Church in Germany what our Ritualists are doing on a smaller scale for the Church of England. 'You are right,' said the priest, 'the Protestants in Germany had religion at one time, but it died out among them, and we rekindled the lamp, and have kept it burning in the Catholic Church.' The Jesuits have preserved Catholicism in Germany, but evidently not that kind of Catholicism in which the Old Catholics believe.

To whatever this movement comes, there are no signs of its dying out in the space of three years. It has shown an amount of vitality for which few in England were prepared to give it credit. The active leadership has passed from Döllinger to younger and more vigorous men. Its great champions are now the hard-headed Prussians, who are as determined to sweep

Ultramontanism from the empire, as they were to keep the French from Berlin. The cause has not declined in Munich, but the great battle will be on the banks of the Rhine. The movement is supported by half the educated Catholics of Germany. In Cologne two thousand two hundred persons have subscribed themselves Old Catholics, and these are mainly from the professional and trading classes. If the movement fails, it will not be for want of ability in its leaders, nor of enthusiasm in its adherents.

XVI.

THE OLD CATHOLIC MOVEMENT.*

IT was with no ordinary interest that many English clergymen, in September this year, turned their steps towards the ancient city of Cologne. It had been announced that the second Congress of the Old Catholics was to meet there, and that there were to be present representatives from nearly all the Churches not in communion with the See of Rome. It would not be an easy task to trace all the remote causes which contributed to the congregating of so many men of such widely divergent religious opinions as were assembled at the Cologne Congress. But two of them, we think, are supremely manifest. One is a growing desire for unity among all the separated Churches; and the other a desire to study and understand the real character of the Old Catholic movement.

We are often reminded that as Englishmen we are only islanders, and that too high an estimate of themselves and their own ways is one of the failings of people who live in an island. It is quite true that to

* *Contemporary Review*, November, 1872.

understand many things on the Continent we must put ourselves, as it were, outside of English life, and even, if possible, of English ideas. We must learn to see things as they are in themselves, avoiding the common mistake of confounding similarity with identity. The development of ideas in different countries has the same variety as the developments of history. Even in the same country phases of thought belonging to different eras must not always be regarded as identical. Every river has its own channel, and every bird its own course through the air.

The Old Catholic movement is a reformation. It has many things in common with the Reformation of the sixteenth century. But there are also many things in which it differs. It was impossible that it could be the same after three hundred years of world progress. Since that time the whole realm of nature has been explored. We have measured the stars, and weighed the mountains, and for nearly these three hundred years the earth has been going round the sun instead of the sun going round the earth. Many religious persons in England will be disappointed that the Old Catholics do not appeal to the Bible, and the Bible alone, and many more will wonder at the prominence given to reason and science. All parties in England will be disappointed till they have learned to look upon the Old Catholic movement as it is in itself, and to follow it in its own natural course of development.

By reading the Bible Luther saw the errors of the Church of Rome. But the Bible is only one of the elements that have given life to the present movement. To trace its entire history it would be necessary to go

back almost, if not altogether, to the time of the Reformation. The residue of Catholics who withstood Luther expected to maintain Catholicism in Germany without the presence of that Ultramontanism which, in the sixteenth century, had been the chief cause of the corruption of the Church. They struggled for reformation on what they called Catholic grounds, but no reformation ever came. The Jesuits were of great service to the Church externally. They reconverted whole districts of Protestants, and gave Catholicism a new influence over the uneducated. But the Jesuits were Ultramontanes, and even while they were converting Germany to Catholicism they were hated by the Old German Catholics.

During the last century and the beginning of this, Germany has come into the possession of a rich literature. It has taken the first place for intellect among the nations. The fame of its scholars is recorded in all lands. It is true that, with but few exceptions, the great thinkers of Germany—the metaphysicians, the theologians, the historians, yea, even the poets—have been Protestants. But the thoughts of these men have become the thoughts of the nation. They have moulded Catholics as well as Protestants. This was a new element that helped to widen the breach between the Old German Catholics and the Ultramontanes. Efforts were made to separate the Catholic population from the influence of the free Protestant spirit. These efforts had great success, but their success was not complete. Catholic professors were in the same Universities with Protestant professors, and Catholic laymen of the higher classes received the

same education as Protestant laymen. The result was inevitable. Educated Catholics ceased to believe dogmas or to regard rites that depended solely on the authority of the Church. The substance of Christianity was more esteemed than ceremonies, and the light of reason preferred to Papal decrees. Horace says of nature that, though thrust out with a pitchfork, it will ever return; and so with these Catholics conscience and reason asserted their claims, and refused to be expelled.

The crisis had really come some years before the assembling of the Vatican Council. There were earnest men in the Catholic Church who saw the absolute necessity of not ignoring the lessons of science. Some of these lessons were supposed not to be in accordance with all the doctrines of the Church, and the question was raised whether science should yield to faith or faith to science. The Pope and the Ultramontanes took the first alternative. Science in this connection meant not only all natural knowledge, but all the lessons of reason and conscience. Faith meant the authority of the Church, which, with the Ultramontanes, was the authority of the Pope. The Liberal Catholics had before them the same problem which has occupied the minds of many earnest men in England—the reconciliation of science with religion. They expected that, with time and thought and the divine guidance which is promised to patient inquiry, the apparent divergence would be removed. It was, however, certain that some of the doctrines of the Church would have to yield. But these, the Liberal Catholics maintained, were merely doctrines that de-

pended on the authority of the Pope, and had really no place in the essential constitution of the Church. The storm had been raging for many years in Catholic Germany. Papal briefs and excommunications had become frequent. At length the final step was taken of convening an Œcumenical Council, which would decree that the Pope was infallible, and that, therefore, doctrines resting on his authority were doctrines of the Church.

This was the legitimate climax of the principles of Ultramontaniam. The Vatican Council was the declaration of a war of extermination against Liberal Catholicism. It excluded not merely theologians like Dr. Frohschammer, who had maintained the necessity of all dogmas undergoing a scientific dissolution, that the Church might be brought back to the simple Christianity of Christ; but it excluded, also, men like Dr. Döllinger, who rested their Catholicism on the science of history. The Council said to all alike that Catholicism was authority, and that the Catholic faith was to believe in the Pope's decrees.

This is our interpretation of the origin of the movement. But we shall follow briefly the account given by Professor Reinkens in a lecture specially on the subject. He describes the movement as the voice of God in man striving against the voice of the tempter from without, or conscience against compulsion in matters of religion. The new dogma is the legitimate result of the system of Church policy that for centuries has been pursued by the Roman Curia. It has been the means during these centuries of thrusting one half of Christendom out of communion with the

Roman See. Before July 18, 1870, Protestants believed that Catholics had no more freedom of conscience than they have now. Professor Reinkens denies this. The Popes have acted as if they were infallible, and their briefs against such men as Hermes and Günther have found ready executors in such bishops as Von Geissel and Förster. The same happened in former times with the Papal Constitutions against Bajus, Jansenius, and Quesnel. The bishops enforced them, with, however, the honourable exception of the Episcopate of Utrecht. Before the Vatican Council the Pope had claimed to be the final arbiter of all differences, and this position he made good by the help of temporal princes. Something like this had been ascribed to the Bishops of Rome by the Council of Sardica in the fourth century. In the eleventh century the Bishops of Rome, as Patriarchs of the West, claimed jurisdiction over the whole Western Church. In the beginning of the fifteenth century there were three Popes contending for the supremacy. The Councils of Constance and Basel decided that the sovereign authority over the Church did not rest in the Pope, but in General Councils. The Roman Curia, however, learned nothing. Reforms were still refused. The Reformation followed, which divided the Western Church. This only led to a still greater centralization on the part of the Roman Curia. The Pope, by the help of the Jesuits and of temporal rulers, both Protestant and Catholic, was able to bring all the bishops into vassalage to himself. Henceforth there was nothing said of their duties towards their flocks, but only of their duties towards their 'Lord,' the Bishop

of Rome. The unity and life of the Church depended now on obedience to authority.

But in spite of all this, Professor Reinkens says, individual Catholics had still liberty of conscience. For the sake of Church privileges and civil rights they were compelled to bow to Rome. Yet in conscience they were not compelled to believe that what the Pope decreed was in itself true and right. Even Herzenröther, a famous theologian on the side of the Curia, admits that the bishops received the doctrinal decisions of the Pope, not because they were right, but because of the authority of the Chair of Peter: that is, Reinkens says, because of the *de facto* power of the Popes. But this did not disturb the consciences of the faithful. They still rested on the authority of the Councils of Constance and Basel. By these the supremacy of Councils to Popes had been decreed, and their decrees, with the confirmation of the Pope, had become law for the German people. Frederick III. would not give up the supremacy of Councils, and Eugenius IV., who eight years before had held the Council of Florence, to which infallibilists appeal for infallibility, yielded to the Emperor. Lainez, the General of the Jesuits, denied, at the Council of Trent, the divine institution of bishops, that he might exalt the Pope over General Councils; but his views were strenuously resisted. Whatever, therefore, the Pope might decree, a Catholic could always appeal to a General Council, and so save his conscience. He could still say, as St. Bernard of Clairvaux said to Eugenius III., 'You have the power, but you have not the right. You do what you ought not to do.' A Catholic submitted to

the Papal decrees as a citizen to an unjust government, under appeal. Since the Vatican Council all this is changed. Submission to a decree is now a confession that it is true and right. The Pope demands the subjection of reason and conscience. This is the acknowledged doctrine of the Jesuits, who inculcate the sacrifice of reason. Reinkens illustrates this by a cloister rule. If a superior tells an inferior to take some flowers and plant them with the roots upwards, the inferior must obey. If he is further told that it was the design of the Creator that the roots should grow upwards, and that the contrary is against the laws of nature, the inferior must believe that this is true. In former times Catholic youths were taught even out of their catechisms that the voice of conscience is the voice of God; but now Bishop Krementz, of Ermland, for instance, says that the Church is above conscience. Conscience, as the old Fathers said, is the Logos, the Word of God within us, and no external authority can be above it. Conscience judges every word and every law that comes from without, and tries it if it be from God. It can only receive what comes to it through the medium of reason and freedom, and not what comes in the way of force. Every authority must approve itself to conscience. Christ's words make our hearts burn within us, and therefore we obey the voice out of the excellent glory which bids us 'Hear Him.'

While the Council was sitting, and the German bishops were determined in their opposition to the new dogma, there was hope of the Liberal party being able to maintain their ground. But when the bishops

submitted, the cause of the Old Catholics was almost wrecked. The leadership devolved on Dr. Döllinger, but Döllinger was not Luther. A man of books and thought, rather than of action, he pursued a cautious—some say a timid—policy. He was afraid of making a new sect. He wanted to reform the Catholic Church, not to destroy it. All this was praiseworthy, but in the meantime he was missing his opportunity: He discontinued his sacerdotal functions. He raised no standard around which other priests could rally. At the moment when the Government would have secured excommunicated priests in their parishes, Dr. Döllinger was studying how to avoid a schism. It is true that his position was difficult. The crisis came suddenly when there was no organized party ready to act. The men who refused submission were not all of one mind. The time that should have been spent in action was required for deliberation. But, in spite of all these chances, the movement lives. It is only since the Cologne Congress that we have had any idea how deep, how intelligent, and how widely spread was the German dissatisfaction with many of the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, and how great the indignation at the conduct of the Vatican Council.

The Congress discussed the pastoral organization of the Old Catholics, their relation to other Confessions, the reforms which they wish to see effected in the Catholic Church, and their own rights in relation to the State as against the Vatican Church. From the first the Old Catholics have tried to avoid a schism. But they are excommunicated, and so far they have to

endure a schism. The Abbé Michaud and Pastor Kaminiski recommended taking their stand on the first seven Councils, and so declaring themselves, on this ground, a separate party from the Vatican Church. But the position advocated by the other leaders, and adopted by the Congress, was that they declare themselves Old Catholics, agreeing with the Church as it existed before the new dogma of July 18, 1870. The reasons for this course were many, and show the prudence and sagacity of the leaders. In the first place, they are not prepared to make any reforms. The time is not come. They must do nothing to compromise their position as Old Catholics. They must not give the Vatican Church the opportunity of saying they have changed, nor must they do anything to interfere with their rights in relation to the State.

The series of resolutions which concerned their pastoral organization embraced only those things which were necessary for existence. They consisted for the most part of vindications of the right of the Old Catholic priests to continue their functions, disregarding the prohibitions of bishops who have fallen from the faith. It was decided that a bishop should be elected for the community. One resolution reserved 'for the constitutional organs of the Church the reform of deeply-felt abuses,' adding 'that for the present a salutary and undoubtedly justifiable reform is to be aimed at in the abolition of surplice fees, the sale of masses, abuses and corruptions of the system of indulgences, veneration of saints, scapularies, medals, &c.' The 'constitutional organs,' to whom reform is ultimately referred, we suppose to be the 'organs' of the

Old Catholic community, after the election of a bishop. They will, of course, include any other bishops who may be willing to make these reforms. There was a curious discussion about the marriages of Old Catholics. It was finally decided that marriage by a Vatican priest was not ecclesiastically valid. On this decision the Congress was not unanimous, and it has been noticed that it is not in accordance with the principle of not separating from the Catholic Church. It was, however, explained in the discussion that the Vatican priest's act is regarded only as not valid for Old Catholics. They must repudiate the Vatican Church as fallen from the faith.

The question of union with other Confessions was a natural sequel to the settlement of their own internal organization. But here, again, the Old Catholics could as yet take no final step. While they claimed the ground of Catholics as the Catholic Church stood before the Vatican decree, they were bound by the Articles of the Creed of Pope Pius IV. The Bishop of Lincoln, in his letter accepting the invitation to the Congress, pointed out that this is, and ever must be, a barrier to their union with the English Church. He exhorted them in all his addresses to go back to the Holy Scriptures, as interpreted by the unanimous consent of the Primitive Church. Döllinger had set forth as a possible ground of union the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the first seven Councils. The Greek Church already occupied nearly the same ground. But the Old Catholics cannot move from the position where present circumstances compel them to stand. And when they do move, it will probably be to make

a more thorough reformation than even that of the sixteenth century. If the authority of the Vatican Church is rejected, the authority, as such, of the Tridentine Church must go with it; and if the authority of the Councils of Trent and the Vatican is not to be received, the authority of no other Council can be received, except on the ground that its decisions approve themselves to reason and conscience. The moment men reject that kind of authority claimed by the Vatican Council, they pass over to the category of those who claim the right to use their own judgment. This was implied, though perhaps not admitted, in the whole of the Bishop of Lincoln's argument. The doctrine of those whom he recognised as legitimate rulers in the Church was to be tried by Scripture and the Primitive Church. Even the Russian High Priest Janyschew begged that the representatives of German Catholic science would work together with him and other theologians of his Church for a scientific inquiry into Christian truth in the interests of union.

The comprehensive and truly Catholic spirit of the Congress was manifest in inviting not merely representatives of the Oriental and Anglican Churches, but also ministers of the Protestant Church in Germany. It was significant also that the two who came—Dr. Schenkel and Dr. Bluntschli—were both of what is called the Rationalist party. They are both men who have spent their lives in the study of dogma, and have been working out the great problem which Professor Huber set forth as that specially before the Old Catholics—the separation in Christianity of the permanent from the transient, the essential from the accidental.

Bluntschli recognised the original tendency of the Old Catholics to make common cause with the Churches that rested on dogmas and hierarchies. They approached nearer to the Greek Church and the High Church party in the Church of England than to the German Protestants. This was natural for men who had been born and educated in a hierarchical Church. But they were Germans. Here was a bond of union already existing between the Old Catholics and the German Protestants. They had a common cause as fellow-countrymen, and they were both penetrated with the spirit of German science. Dr. Bluntschli expressed his belief that no union was possible on the basis of dogma. Every formulary of the truth is relative and not absolute. Dogmas are but the different colours through which the light falls on the eyes of individual men. We cannot even hope for unity in modes of worship, or in the same Church constitution, but we have a clear ground in morality and Christian life.

On the subject of Christian union, the speakers on the Old Catholic side uttered some noble words. The Coryphæus was Professor Reinkens. He at once set aside the idea that union was uniformity. Different nations must be allowed free scope for the development of national peculiarities. Differences and distinctions in many points must remain. 'The ground of reunion,' said the orator, 'lies in the hearts of the faithful, in the consciousness that we are God's children, of the household of God, and that we should have no strife one with another.' It could not proceed from states or hierarchies, but must come from

the inward realisation of Christian life and love. Professor Michelis, in one of his bold illustrations, compared the present state of the Christian Church to that of the great Cathedral of Cologne, as he saw it when a student thirty years ago. It was then in ruins, hung over with many things that did not belong to a cathedral. But that morning he had seen it rising to a glorious completion. Its stately grandeur was being restored, and day by day it was coming to the realisation of a beautiful and a perfect unity. And so he hoped it would yet be with the now divided and almost ruined Church of Christ. 'I add,' said the speaker, 'that but for the good Protestant King Frederick William IV. the cathedral would not have been what it now is. And I am convinced that without the help of Protestantism the great work begun in the Catholic Church in Germany will never be completed.' The following are the resolutions on the subject of reunion:—

'The Congress reiterates the expression of hope for a reunion of the now divided Christian Confessions, as contained in the Munich programmes of Whitsuntide and September, 1871. It expresses the wish that the theologians of all Confessions may direct their attention to this point, and it elects a Committee to which the commission is given—

'1. To put itself in communication with the already existing Societies (or those in the course of formation) for the removal of Schism.

'2. To promote scientific examination into the existing differences, and to show the possibility of their removal; also to publish the results of these examinations in theological scientific works and journals.

'3. To promote by means of popular writings and essays the knowledge of the doctrines, usages, and condition of the separated Churches and Confessions; to properly estimate the existing points of unity and difference, and to awaken and to maintain in wider circles an interest in Christian union.

On the Monday morning the representatives of the different Churches held a meeting in the small room of the Gürzenich. Secretaries were appointed, to correspond with each other for the furtherance of union. The English clergy reminded the committees that they had no executive power. With this explanation Lord Charles Hervey accepted the office of Secretary for the English and American Churches.

The Old Catholic movement would have but little interest for us if its reforms did not go beyond those which were voted at the Congress. But the avowed sentiments of the leaders give us hope for far greater things than any which are now proposed. Men whose opposition to Roman authority had its ground in conscience, when they have begun to move are not likely to stop at any half reformation. A priest who, under the signature of 'A Bavarian Catholic,' wrote an article in a recent number of this Review on the Old Catholic movement, reproached the leaders, especially Dr. Dollinger, with timidity and halfness. This reproach has been repeated in Germany by those who, like this writer, have bounded from Roman Catholicism to what would be called a rationalistic view of Christianity. It was urged that many of the educated Catholic laity had so entirely departed from the dogmas of the Church that they only smiled at any movement which merely rejected the dogma of Papal infallibility. This reproach was specially noticed by Professor Huber. Their 'halfness,' he said, meant that they were on the way, and had not yet reached the goal. Every true movement, every true development must have stages. Their 'halfness' was not half-heartedness. They

wished the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. They were engaged in separating that in Christianity which was permanent from that which was changing; and this was a work which 'required time, with the whole force of German earnestness and German thoroughness.' This was not indeed a confession that the goal towards which they were aiming is what is called Rationalism, but it was a confession that if at the end of their inquiry this should appear to be the truth, they will not scruple openly to embrace it. The movement is a movement, and not a finality—a process, and not the proclamation of a dogma.

Professor Knoodt, in a brilliant speech, laid down the principle that divine guidance was only given to those who first make use of their natural faculties. The Vatican Council made no examination into what was the doctrine of the Old Church, of the Fathers, or of the Holy Scriptures. The Pope at once took the place of these, declared himself infallible, and the Council gave their consent. This was in contradiction to revelation, to reason, and to the entire culture-development of the human race. Professor Friedrich also noticed the reproach, that they were fighting only against Papal infallibility; and he added, 'We oppose the whole Papal system as a system of errors which has been growing for the last thousand years, and has only reached its climax in the dogma of infallibility.' These errors must be swept away, that we may get back to the simple doctrine of Jesus Christ. He enumerated many things which demanded reformation as soon as the reforms could be legitimately secured. Among these were the performance of divine service

in the language of the people, the abolition of the Confessional, of religious orders, and of the celibacy of the clergy. Professor Michelis wished to be regarded no more as a Roman Catholic, but simply as a Catholic holding the Catholic doctrine of Jesus Christ. Professor Reinkens declared that God's voice in the conscience is the only sovereign authority over the human soul. The kingdom of God does not consist of bishops and priests. It is no dead external mechanism, but a living power in the hearts of men. Wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Church. Dr. Tangermann, in all his sermons and addresses, is continually repeating the same truth. The Church of Christ is built not on the man Peter, or any visible hierarchy, but on the truth which Peter confessed, and the power of that truth in the human soul. His favourite text is, 'The kingdom of God is within you.' The crying necessity for reformation was set forth by Shulte, in language as clear, and in denunciation as strong, as anything ever heard even in Exeter Hall. He did not scruple to speak of the Confessional as the means of the moral corruption of Catholic society. Children had thoughts put into their heads which would never have been there but for the priests' questions; and the peace of families was destroyed through the insinuations of the confessors. He said that morality in the Catholic parts of Germany was immensely below the standard of morality among German Protestants, and this he ascribed mainly to the practice of confession.

It is worthy of notice that there are men in the Church of England earnestly labouring to introduce

the very things peculiar to the Roman Catholic religion which educated Catholics in Germany are rejecting. There is something attractive in seeing the masses of the people coming to church and being subject to the authority of the clergy. A Protestant can scarcely enter a Roman Catholic church without at least a transient feeling that in matters of external service Protestantism has something to learn from Catholicism. This is our excuse for the Ritualists. It is this which never allows us to refuse them credit for sincerity and self-devotion. But experience has its lessons. The Catholics of Germany have seen the work of the Jesuits and its fruits. They have seen the uneducated attached to the Church by means of processions, shows, and ceremonies. They have seen the people made Catholic and becoming very religious without their being made moral. This is the testimony of the Old Catholics. We cannot speak of the facts, for they are beyond the reach of our examination. But this is why the Old Catholics wish to be rid of that merely ceremonial Catholicism which they say the Jesuits have imported into Germany. Hitherto in England religion has gone hand-in-hand with morality, and the inference was for us a natural one that the increase of even ceremonial religion would be followed by improvement in the manner of life. We as little doubt the sincerity and self-denial of the Jesuits as of the Ritualists; but sincerity and self-denial have not always desirable results.

The following resolutions were passed on the last subject—the relation of the Old Catholics to the State:—

‘The Congress confidently expects that the Governments of the German and Austrian States, as well as that of Switzerland, will take a firm and clear position in the present religious troubles, not only that they will uphold the declaration contained in official decrees, “That no legal efficacy is to be attached to the Vatican decrees of the 18th July, 1870;” but that they will also give practical realisation to the difference—which was the basis of this declaration—between the Catholic Church, legally and historically founded, and as such recognised by the State, and the Ultramontane-Roman Church, constituted by those decrees, and devoid of every dogmatic and historical basis. It is expected that the Governments will (A) Consider the Catholics holding fast to the Old Catholic Church, and who repudiate the Vatican decrees as an innovation, as members of the Church recognised by the State, and as such to be protected. (B) On the other hand, that they will consider the bishops who have adopted the Vatican innovation—and their organs—as deprived of all jurisdiction over the Old Catholics, who without this are declared in the Vatican decrees as not belonging to the New Catholic sect.

‘That, as a necessary consequence—

‘1. The bishops elected and consecrated among the Old Catholics shall be recognised as bishops of the Catholic Church:—(1.) As endowed with the same competency over the Old Catholic communities as belongs to Catholic bishops according to the existing laws. (2.) As having a right to dotations from the State Treasury. (3.) The Old Catholic priests as entitled to appointments to the livings under the patronage of the State, and to the institutions of the State, and to dotations from the funds of the State. (4.) For the present, an Old Catholic bishop, though residing in another State, as legitimatised for the exercise of Episcopal jurisdiction. (5.) The elected bishops to take the oath of loyalty. And further,

‘2. The priests chosen by the Old Catholic communities are to be recognised as priests competent to perform all acts with legal efficacy to which the State attributes civil effects, especially the celebration of marriage and the keeping of the civil register, according to custom, or to the laws of the State.

‘3. The general introduction of the obligatory civil marriage, and the surrender of the civil register to civil officials, are declared by the Congress to be urgently necessary.

‘4. The Old Catholic communities are, as such, by reason of the recognition of the Catholic Church in the State, and without any special grant of corporative rights, subjects legitimate for the

exercise of those rights which the law of the State permits to religious communities, or which belong to them, according to the ecclesiastical law.

'5. The Old Catholics are not bound to contribute to the ecclesiastical objects of the New Catholics.

'6. The Old Catholic communities are urgently recommended to strive for the repossession of the property of the Catholic Church, by administrative and legal proceedings.

'7. The Old Catholics have the unqualified right to demand the joint use of all churches consecrated to the Catholic service, since the same are consecrated to the Catholic worship, whether we assume that the church belongs to itself, or adopt the theory that the end would justify us in demanding it, or whether, according to the law of the land, the religious community is the possessor, since the apostacy of the one cannot rob the other of its rights.

'8. The Old Catholics retain all rights to the other Church properties, livings, schools, &c.

'9. The Old Catholics have retained the claim to demand sums granted by the budget for Catholic worship and instruction.

'10. For the carrying out of points 5 to 7 the Old Catholic Central Committee for each country will enter into an understanding with the State.'

M. de Pressensé, criticizing the proceedings of the Congress in the *Journal des Débats*, describes this anxiety about the relations to the State as the weak side of the Old Catholics. There is something about it peculiarly German. In England it is a vexed question if the State connection does good or harm. In France the Protestant Synod decreed to ask separation from the State. In Germany it is altogether different. There every reforming party believes in the State, and in the power of the State for good. The relation of Churches to civil governments is by no means a question so easily solved as some persons suppose. A State must protect itself. This it cannot always do if it is indifferent to what the people are taught. A Church established in an empire, and

simply having unrestricted religious liberty, may become dangerous to that empire. There may come a contest for right, which can only be settled by might. The State relations with Churches in Germany are complex, and of that kind which amply justify the Old Catholics in appealing to Cæsar. All persons have to pay a tax on their income for religion. If they are Catholics, the tax goes to support the Catholic religion, and if they are Protestants, it goes to the support of the Protestant religion. It would of course be simpler if they all subscribed voluntarily to the form of religion which each approved. But it is here that the State protects its rights. It holds by this means the churches and all Church property as State property. This is its power over the Church. This is its check upon the priesthood and the hierarchy. In their circumstances it is something for the Old Catholics to be able to maintain their position in the Church. Apart from the advantage of having the State on their side, they save themselves from the reproach of being the party that has changed. This might be nothing in itself, but it is something in the judgment of the people.

The decision to appoint a bishop did not meet with universal approbation. So far as it goes, it is a measure of separation. The bishop cannot be consecrated by the other bishops, and in their judgment he will be no more a true bishop than Dr. Wordsworth or a Lutheran superintendent. The succession may be secured through the Archbishop of Utrecht, who traces his through an excommunicated Jansenist. It is ecclesiastically an irregularity, and can only find its

justification in the same kind of necessity which caused Calvin to establish a government by presbyters, or Wesley to consecrate bishops for America. The step is taken by the Old Catholics as a necessity. They give their community an episcopal form merely as a matter of order, and not at all from the stand-point of our Anglican High Churchmen that episcopacy is necessary to the constitution of a Church. A Synod, consisting partly of laymen, is to share with the bishop the ecclesiastical government. Professor Friedrich declared his conviction that a priest could confirm as well as a bishop; and Professor Reinkens, in a lecture delivered at Crefeld, expressly denies that there is any particular gift of grace connected with the office of a bishop.

After hearing the speakers in the Old Catholic Congress, it is not difficult to see the object at which they aim. They have broken away from authority, and have claimed as their Christian inheritance freedom to think for themselves. According to Reinkens, this freedom has always existed in the Catholic Church. It has only been taken away by the long and at last successful efforts of the Roman Curia. They separate from the Vatican Church only so far as they are compelled to protest against its errors. Their hope is ultimately to effect reforms, not merely in their own community, but throughout the entire Roman Catholic Church. Their prospect of success in this is only small. That same Ultramontane spirit which in the sixteenth century sacrificed England and the half of Germany is not likely to promote reforms that will conciliate the Old Catholics. It is, however, impos-

sible to say how great a conflagration may yet arise out of this little spark of living fire. Were the government—as a writer in the *Times* supposes might be the case—to appoint reformers like Döllinger or Reinkens over such sees as Cologne or Breslau, we should have a repetition of what happened in England when Henry VIII. elevated Cranmer to the Primacy. It is true that the Ultramontanes are on the watch. They have united their entire wisdom, which will scarcely, we think, allow such a repetition of history. But on the other hand they are not on the best terms with any of the great governments of Europe, and they have put themselves in sharp opposition with the spirit of progress and human development. A Jesuit father said to the present writer, that the Old Catholic movement was merely a movement of educated laymen, and that it does not touch the masses. This, in a general sense, is clearly true: yet in places where the priests have gone with the movement, the people have gone with the priests. It is mainly at present a movement of professors, supported by the intelligent and trading classes. The other side has its strength in the priests and the uneducated. It is confidently asserted by the Old Catholics that many of the priests will join the movement if the governments secure them against being deposed by the bishops. In this case there is little doubt that the uneducated classes would go with the priests.

We cannot isolate the study of this movement from the study of other religious movements in other parts of the world. It is but a phase of the great upheaving of modern intellect on the subject of religion. The

Old Catholics have before them all the complex unsolved problems of the age. The nature of external authority in religion in its ultimate and logical form has been forced home to them, and they have repelled it with all the indignation of men who feel that they have hearts and souls. But the path of authority once abandoned, there is a long journey before rest can be found, and then it is another kind of rest from that which depends on authority. Councils, Apostles, Fathers, the Bible itself, cease to be authorities in the sense that the Church of Rome understands authority. Their words find entrance into the human heart just in the degree that they have a divine power, and that that power is felt. Christ's words are spirit and life. The words of all good and true men are spirit and life. That spirit becomes one with our spirit, and that life invigorates our life. All external authority apart from this is a dead mechanism—a letter which killeth, and not a spirit that giveth life. The Old Catholics may not have seen this in its rigidly logical form, but they have felt it, and some of them have certainly expressed it. The multitude of people would prefer that religion came to them externally. This would save them all the trouble and anxiety involved in thinking over hard and difficult problems. And in one aspect human necessities seem to demand this. But our thoughts are not always God's thoughts. There are two alternatives: we can either, like the Vatican Council, invent a way for God and say this must be right; or we may look humbly and patiently at what really is, and in the world of facts find out God's way.

XVII.

CATHOLICS AND CATHOLICS.

IT is probable that there never was an age of the world when men were so much in earnest about religion as the present. Other ages may have had more zeal, more worship, and more decision, but they must all yield to the present in a simple, unbiassed determination to know the truth and to follow it. This is pre-eminently true in England. We may credit equally the sincerity of those who have left the Protestant Church for the Church of Rome, of those who have embraced a newer form of Christianity, or who have renounced Christianity in every form. We do not mean that in every case the inquirer has been without a bias, or that no motive, unknown perhaps even to himself, may have been at work; but we do mean that the great majority of men who have thought about religious questions at all, have thought about them with earnestness, and that their great desire has been to know the truth.

We do not admire the spirit in which Monsignor Capel lately treated the Ritualists. It is no doubt

very provoking to be imitated by those who have no right to imitate. But whatever may be the follies of the Ritualists, they are sincere. They may be fairly the subjects of ridicule for Protestants, but from Roman Catholics they have a right to every sympathy. In England they have rehabilitated the idea of Catholicism, and in some measure wiped away the reproach connected with the very name. Between the Catholic who yields implicit obedience to the Roman see in matters of faith, and the Catholic who uses his private judgment in interpreting the Fathers, there must ever be a wide distinction. But both will be ultimately found together in one of the two great classes into which the world is rapidly being divided in its estimate of Christianity. The Roman Catholic and the Anglo-Catholic both rely on authority. They both profess to possess what all men naturally wish to have. But notwithstanding the assurance with which they boast of their Catholicism, they are not agreed as to where this authority is to be found.

We use the word 'Catholic' not only conventionally, but as yet indefinitely. We mean by it the general idea of a Church claiming authority to speak with certainty. The name was appropriated by many of the ancient sects. The Arians and the Donatists equally with the Orthodox claimed to be Catholic. In our own time neither the name Catholic nor the claim involved in the name is limited to the Church of Rome. We say nothing at present of the sense recognised in the Prayer-Book, in which all who profess and call themselves Christians are admitted to be members of the universal or Catholic Church. We

only speak of the idea of authority implied in the word Catholic in its conventional sense. The idea has a philosophical side. It is supposed to rest on the common sense or reason of men. This was Augustine's argument when he said, 'Judicat securus orbis terrarum.' It was weak in the way that Augustine applied it; but there was philosophy in the idea. In fact, it was borrowed from the philosophers whose dogmas were truths of the universal or Catholic reason. Seneca recognises the principle, and like a true Catholic finds in it the end of all controversy, that authority which gives us tranquillity, and by which we arrive at that truth which is otherwise beyond our reach.* The same defence has been made in modern times by some of the ablest advocates of the Church of Rome.† It is an appeal to common sense on the ground that what is generally believed, or rather what is generally agreeable to the reason of mankind, must be true. The principle, especially in morals or as a rule of life, must be admitted to be correct. There is a common sense, as it were, outside of us as individuals which is treasured up in the experience of society. The individual mind might, if it had opportunities, reason it out; but we are generally safest at once to fall in with the Catholic sense of the community. It applies in politics as well as in morals. We look to Acts of Parliament for the sense of the nation, and in the same way, according to

* 'Non contingit tranquillitas nisi immutabile certumque judicium adeptis, ceterique decidunt subinde et reponuntur, et inter ommissa appetitaque alternis fluctuantur,' &c. (Ep. xcv.)

† 'La seule foi est celle qui repose selon le genre de vérité qui en est l'objet, sur la plus grande autorité ou sur la raison la plus general.'—'Essai sur l'Indifférence,' par M. L'Abbé de La Mennais, vol. ii. p. 185.

Roman Catholic writers, we look to the Church as the spiritual society for decisions or dogmas in religion.*

That an idea with so much truth in it should have early found a place in Christianity is not surprising. It is scarcely marvellous, all things considered, that men should cling to it even under forms that experience itself has refuted. It gives a practical rule. In fact, the first error is its transference from the practical to things out of the reach of experience. If the Church were merely a society which prescribed a rule of spiritual life, the analogy of a common reason would be correct. Our individual reason would lead us to the reasonableness of falling in with the life of the spiritual society. And this, in reality, is what we all do; but this is far short of the ordinary claims of a Catholic Church. The certainty of what is generally received as right, either in social or civil life, is only of a regulative character. It is not necessarily absolute, nor is it necessary that it should be. In religion we crave more, and men reason that if this craving is to be satisfied the authority must be infallible, the rule perfect, and the certainty absolute.

To satisfy this craving the idea of following a general consent or common reason is connected with some corporate body. As we are not to follow a multitude to do evil, it cannot be merely the voice of mankind as expressed by the majority that is to be our guide. So far we are fairly at liberty to depart from the Catholic voice of humanity. The phenomena of the mind of the human race must be taken from

* 'Essai sur l'Indifférence,' vol. ii. pp. 183—6.

the general judgment or agreement of educated and earnest men. But we cannot take the educated and earnest men of all religions, so that here the law of Catholicity in its proper and primary sense absolutely fails. To come at the Church we must first suppose Christianity true, and the Catholic or universal reason must be that of Christians only. The idea of Catholicity is further limited not merely to Christianity, but to the Church, sect, or party which claims the title of Catholic. The philosophical idea of a common reason is lost in the demand of a corporate body to instruct with authority even this universal, common, or Catholic reason.

This will be evident if we trace historically the idea of Catholicism in Christianity. We may grant that Jesus Christ established a Church or society. That Church was to consist of teachers and learners. It had a constitution or government, and Christ promised His presence with it to the end of the world. If we have in our minds the Roman Catholic idea of a Church these words will convey one meaning, if we have the Protestant idea they will convey another meaning. A society might be established which was not always to continue in the same form. It might have teachers commissioned by Christ without these teachers being infallible. It might have a government without any necessity of that government being always the same. Christ might be with His disciples always without giving them immunity from error in every question of doctrine. What the words really meant must in this case be determined by the facts of history so far as we know them.

It has often been remarked that the word Catholic applied to the Church never occurs in any of the writings of the New Testament. It came in later with the rise of controversies. It originated with the desire for an arbiter of differences, and with the half truth that the general sense of the Christian community was more likely to be right than individual reason. We have already seen how far the principle is true. It was not sufficient to repress private judgment, for, though deserving respect, it could not speak with authority. It often became a mere question of a majority, and, in some cases—notably in the case of the Arians—the majority was on the wrong side. In the writings of the earliest Christian Fathers it took the form of tradition. The Church was to believe all that had been believed and taught by Christ and His Apostles. The credenda were to be found in Scripture and tradition. But so early as the time of Irenæus heretics appealed to tradition even in preference to Scripture. ‘When they are confuted from the Scriptures,’ Irenæus says, ‘they turn round and accuse these same Scriptures as if they were not correct nor of authority, saying that they are ambiguous, and that the truth cannot be extracted from them by those who are ignorant of tradition.’* These are the very words which Catholics now use in defence of their tradition. The principle as further expounded by the Valentinians was that Christ and His Apostles spoke wisdom ‘among them that were perfect,’ that is, the initiated, and that in this esoteric teaching committed to the Church as a society, we are to look for doctrine rather than to the

* Irenæus, ‘Adversus Hæreses,’ iii. c. ii.

Scriptures. On the other hand, the tradition to which Irenæus appeals is not something distinct from the Scriptures themselves, which he calls ‘the pillar and ground of truth,’* but the Scriptures as understood and handed down by the Churches that were established by the Apostles.

The principle of Irenæus we find strongly urged by Tertullian, although not unmixed with the idea of a secret tradition like that of the Valentinians. That the Catholic Church was right, Tertullian regarded as a conclusion certain previous to all reasoning. Tradition, apart from the Scriptures, or the Church as an authority above the Scriptures, was plainly his rule of faith. We do not expect in a man of Tertullian’s fiery and turbid character any calm or placid statement of principles. He writes with the vehemence of a controversialist. What he believes must be the Catholic faith, and by this a man is to be saved, and not by knowledge of the Scriptures.† He will not reason on the Scriptures with heretics. They do not belong to heretics. They are the property of the Catholic Church; that is, of those who hold the right faith.‡ Churches founded by Apostles were the ‘wombs and original fountains of faith,’§ so that whoever held a doctrine different from these Churches could not be of the true Church, nor have any right of appeal to Scripture. In fact, the Scriptures were so written by the will of God as to produce heretics, and but for the Scriptures heretics would never have existed.|| We are therefore to look for truth in Churches founded by

* Irenæus, iii. c. i.

† De Præs. Hæret., c. xiv.

‡ Ibid., c. xix.

§ Ibid., c. 21.

|| Ibid., c. xxxix.

Apostles. The truth is not to exist by its own force, nor to be committed to books. It is to be handed down from bishop to bishop, and from presbyter to presbyter—

‘Let them’ (the heretics), says Tertullian, ‘produce the original records of their Churches; let them unfold the roll of their bishops, running down in due succession from the beginning in such manner that their first distinguished bishop should be able to show for his ordainer and predecessor some one of the Apostles, or of apostolic men—a man, moreover, who continued steadfast with the Apostles. For this is the manner in which the Apostolic Churches transmit their registers—as the Church of Smyrna, which records that Polycarp was placed there by St. John; as also the Church of Rome, which makes Clement to have been ordained in like manner by Peter.’*

This was accompanied by arguments from the priority of truth to error, and the existence of God before the devil. These were borrowed from paganism, or at least from pagan philosophy. In the ‘Octavius’ of Minutius Felix, the plea for the old worship is antiquity, which is called ‘the chief priestess of truth.’† The Gentiles asked the Christians where their religion was before Jesus Christ, just as now Catholics ask Protestants where their religion was before Luther.

In the fifth century we have the treatise of Vincentius Lirinensis expressly on the rule of faith. This he finds first in the Scriptures, and secondly in the tradition of the Catholic Church. The second is added because of the difficulty of understanding the Scriptures. To escape heresy we must take the sense of the Catholic Church as the rule of interpretation. The sum of what is taught in Scripture is to be mea-

* De Præs. Hæret., c. xxxii.

† C. v.

sured by what has been believed 'everywhere, always, and by all,' in the Catholic Church. We have here universality, antiquity, and unanimous consent. To make the argument worth anything we should have a religion that consists of a set of dogmas or doctrines with all these three marks. But Vincentius saw that we had not this, and so he goes from the one to the other in strange confusion. He lived after the rise of the Arians, and knew, as St. Jerome confessed, that the whole world had become Arian.* In this case, he said, where universality fails, we must go to antiquity. Vincentius adopted this rule purely to escape from the difficulty presented by the spread of Arianism. In fact, Arianism was the great error which he seems to have had in view when writing his book. From it he appealed to antiquity precisely as the modern Anglo-Catholic appeals to antiquity against the Church of Rome. But they both violate Tertullian's rule, who makes the appeal to those Churches which were founded by Apostles, and which could show their succession of bishops from the Apostles' time to the present. The prevalence of Arianism in the fourth century, and of Roman errors in the present day in Apostolic sees, annihilate Tertullian's principle of Catholicity. Vincentius was conscious that universality was wanting to what he considered the true faith. He made, therefore, another rule, which limited the Fathers, among whom we were to seek unanimous consent, to those who 'had lived and died in the faith and communion of the Catholic Church.'† To find the faith which was

* 'Ingemuit totus orbis, et Arianum se esse miratus est.'—Dial. adv. Lucif., c. viii.

† C. xxiii.

received 'everywhere, always, and by all,' we are to go to those who believe as we do, that is, we are to determine which is the Catholic faith before we go in search of it.

The two claimants for Catholicity with which we are specially interested are the Roman Catholics and a party in the Church of England. We repeat again that we use the word Catholic conventionally. The Church of England, like all other Protestant Churches, has always claimed to be of the universal or Catholic Church, that is, among the number of those who 'profess and call themselves Christians.' The Church of Rome, in claiming to be the Catholic Church, to the exclusion of all other Christians as heretics, founds its claim on the supremacy of the Roman See. It also holds the Valentinian principle, condemned by Irenæus, that there is a doctrine, or set of doctrines, committed to it independent of the Scriptures. This it calls 'the unwritten word of God.'* Vincentius did not ask more for tradition than the place of an interpreter of Scripture, a conservator of the Catholic sense or meaning of the sacred books. The modern Church of Rome means by tradition something in addition to these books. According to Vincentius, the Church had a deposit of Catholic doctrine committed to it in the Scriptures. He does not speak of a living organ by which the Church is to declare truth infallibly, but only of a method by which the deposit of truth is preserved. With the claim of the Church of Rome to have 'an unwritten word,' apart from the word written,

* See Wiseman's *Lectures on the Catholic Church*, p. 60; also the *Canons of the Council of Trent*.

it can have no anxiety to establish the supremacy of the Roman See out of the Scriptures. That task would be confessedly hopeless. The Church is not dependent on the early Fathers, or, if it were, its case would be still more hopeless. Clemens Romanus writes a letter from 'the Church of God which sojourns at Rome,' to 'the Church of God sojourning at Corinth.'* He speaks of being 'consulted' by the Church of Corinth about some things, but he gives no intimation of authority over them. Tertullian, recounting the Apostolic sees, speaks of Philippi, Ephesus, and Rome, but gives Rome no pre-eminence, except for the blood of so many martyrs.† Cyprian has a remarkable passage on the unity of the Church,‡ where he rests this unity on Peter, but he says nothing of its being continued through the bishops of Rome. In an epistle to Antonianus he speaks of Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, as his 'colleague,' saying that to be in communion with him was to be in communion with the Catholic Church. The passage read apart from the context might be made to mean a great deal for the Church of Rome, but as it stands it avails nothing. Cyprian opposed Pope Stephen on the question of rebaptizing heretics, and Stephen called Cyprian on this account 'a false apostle and a deceitful worker.'§ The eighty-seven bishops who assembled in the Council of Carthage to settle the same question decided contrary to the Bishop of Rome. The passage in the early Fathers which seems most in favour of the Roman claim is in Irenæus, where he speaks of the

* Ep. i.

† Treatise v.

‡ De Præs. Hæret., c. xxxvi.

§ Epistle of Firmilian to Stephen.

Church of Rome having* ‘pre-eminent authority.’ The passage is not clear, and we only have it in a Latin version, with no trace of the Greek words as they were written by the author. Lirinensis, describing the Council of Ephesus, calls it Catholic because it represented the doctrine both of the East and the West. The letters of Felix and Julian were read at this Council not for authority, but as part of the universal consent on which Catholic doctrine was to rest.

The Catholicism of Irenæus, Cyprian, and Vincencius Lirinensis is plainly the Catholicism of the Anglo-Catholic. He holds the theory, however, under circumstances which make it less tenable than with these Fathers. Anglo-Catholics have not an Apostolic see, and they are separate from that see through which they received Christianity. The theory of an old British Church avails nothing here; for the question is one of sees and successions. Canterbury, to which Anglo-Catholics must look, depends on Rome. If it does not agree with the Apostolic seat from which it is derived, by Tertullian’s rule it is not Catholic.† It cannot trace a succession of bishops to an Apostolic see with which it is in communion. The Anglo-Catholic has here his quarrel with the Roman Catholic. It is certain that both cannot be right. The Anglo-Catholic appeals to the Fathers. He knows nothing of an ‘unwritten word,’ distinct from the Scriptures. He is not, like the Roman Catholic, a Valentinian. The succession of bishops is to him the guardians and interpreters of

* Bk. iii. c. iii.

† De Præs. Hæret., c. xxi.

what is committed to the Church in the Scriptures. He is, of course, perplexed with the discordancy of modern bishops. The spirit of grace and supplication has long since departed from them. They ought to have received the tradition of the elders; but they have not, excepting only some exceptions. The 'everywhere, always, and by all' can scarcely have a meaning to the Anglo-Catholic in the face of the existence of the Church of Rome. Like the old Donatist, he calls himself a Catholic, though the 'orbis terrarum' of Christendom is against him.

But his hope is in the Fathers. Often has he proved that the Catholicism of the Church of Rome is not to be found in them. In fact, the Church of Rome has avowedly ceased to rest on the Fathers. It does not require their help. It has an independent life and tradition of its own. But the Anglo-Catholic must take his choice of the Scriptures interpreted as he is able to interpret them, or as he can find them interpreted by antiquity. It is not to be denied that he has many disadvantages. He does not, we hope, forget that in going to the Fathers to get the opinions prevailing in their time, he has to trust mainly to fragments. The Fathers of the first three centuries are not numerous. Their works are not plentiful; some of them are corrupted; and it is only by an effort that any approach to an agreement in doctrine can be found among them. Moreover, they do not discuss directly any of the questions that are now in dispute, at least not in the same forms, so as to enable us to know precisely what their opinions were. We need not dwell on the fact that without the disputed and

certainly corrupted epistles of Ignatius there would be difficulty in establishing the Church on bishops as a distinct order from presbyters. Indeed the elevation and importance which these epistles give to a bishop, when compared with the writings of the other Fathers, is no small evidence of their not being the work of Ignatius. The theory of being guided by the early Fathers is, that they lived so near the time of the Apostles that they must have understood the Scriptures better than we have the means of doing. And this we should beforehand have supposed a right principle, but it is overturned by facts. The oldest of the Fathers is Papias, who is admitted by all to have been such a weak man that no one would think of taking his authority for anything. Irenæus says that he was a disciple of St. John, but Papias himself speaks of deriving the sayings of the Apostles from those who heard them. This he reckoned more satisfactory than trusting to books. We have only a few fragments of his writings, but we can judge of the value of tradition from what he says of Judas. The betrayer, it appears, did not hang himself; but, by divine vengeance, his body grew to such a size, that one day meeting a chariot which he could not pass in a narrow street he was crushed to death, and all his bowels gushed out. Irenæus was a cotemporary of Papias, and a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of St. John. He was intellectually much superior to Papias, and yet Irenæus maintains, both by interpretation of the Gospel history in St. Luke and by tradition received from St. John and other apostles, that Jesus lived till He was between forty and

fifty years of age, and that He thus became ‘an old man for old men.’*

It is true that the interpretations of the Fathers are reasonable compared with those of the early heretics; but we misunderstand the whole case of the Fathers if we suppose that they can be competent guides to the understanding of the Scriptures. They evidently had not the same canon that we have, for many of them quote from books of Scripture not in our canon. They rarely quote the same words, as if they either quoted from memory or from a different version. Not more than one or two of the Fathers could read Hebrew, and some at least of the Latin Fathers were ignorant of Greek. They were therefore dependent for their knowledge of Scripture on the Greek Septuagint or on Latin versions made from it. Tertullian proves the resurrection of the flesh from the Greek version of Psalm xcii. 12: ‘The righteous shall flourish like the phoenix.’† For the divinity of Christ he quotes the Greek version of Isaiah xlv. 14, 15: ‘The Sabeans, men of stature, shall pass over to Thee, and they shall follow after Thee; for Thou art our God, yet we know it not, Thou art the God of Israel.’‡ Justin Martyr showed that there were twelve apostles from the twelve bells carried by the priest, but where he read of the twelve bells we do not know. Ignatius found the institution of the Christian Sabbath in the inscription over one of the psalms, which he translated ‘To the first after the seventh.’ Augustine proved the ‘real presence’

* C. xxii.

† De Resurr. Carnis, c. xiii.

‡ Ad. Praxean. c. xiii.

from an old Latin version of the Bible, which said that David in the presence of the King of Gath carried his body in his own hands. But as this was not true of David it must have been true of Christ.* When the Fathers forsook the plain sense of Scripture, the fertility of their imagination often produced rare flashes of originality. Irenæus found in the story of Lot and his two daughters the two Churches of Jews and Gentiles, who had children to their father.† Balaam riding on his ass was the world resting on the body of Christ.‡ Hippolytus said that Antichrist was to be of the tribe of Dan, because Jacob said of Dan that he should be a serpent in the path.§ Tertullian finds Christ in all the Psalms, like the old Puritans, who said that in reading the Psalms we should keep the right eye on David and the left eye on Christ. The psalmist, Tertullian says, was speaking of the birth of Christ when he said, ‘Thou art He that took me out of my mother’s womb.’|| ‘I am come to save that which was lost’ proves the resurrection of the flesh, for the flesh was lost.¶ Cyprian says that Noah being drunk with wine and lying uncovered in his tent was the prefiguration of Christ’s passion, to be celebrated by drinking wine.** ‘Thy inebriating cup,’ the psalmist exclaims in the 23rd Psalm, ‘how good is it?’ †† It is the same cup, says St. Cyprian, even the cup of the Lord which inebriated Noah when he was drunk with wine.‡‡ The same

* Ennaratio ii. Psalm xxxii.

† Fragment xxiii.

‡ De Resurr. Carnis, c. xx.

** ‘Ep. ad Cœcilium,’ lxiii.

† Book iv. c. xxxi.

§ De Anti-Christo, c. xvi.

¶ Ib., c. xxxiv.

†† Latin version.

‡‡ Ib., c. viii.

Cyprian proves that Christ is God's hand because it is written, 'Is His right hand shortened that it cannot save?' and again, when the psalmist says, 'My heart is inditing good matters in a song,' Cyprian makes the matter to be speech or wisdom, and that speech or wisdom to be Christ.

If we take the doctrine which the Fathers professed to draw from the Scriptures, we shall not find them much wiser than in their interpretations. Notwithstanding the labours of Bishop Bull, it is still a question if the ante-Nicene Fathers really agreed with the doctrine of the Council of Nice. The one centripetal power which really gives them the shadow of agreement is the Platonic idea that the Son of God was the wisdom of God, and the wisdom must have been eternal. Beyond this it would be difficult to find any agreement, not only between the ante-Nicene Fathers and the Council of Nice, but between these Fathers themselves. Tertullian, who is eloquent on the wisdom of God as the eternal manifestation of Deity, yet falls into the speech of the Arians, saying that there was a time when the Son was not.* Again, he says that 'the Father is the entire substance, but the Son is a derivation and portion of the whole.'† Cyprian, too, makes the wisdom of God created.‡ In fact, the Fathers were led into this error by their ignorance of Hebrew. Where Wisdom says in the book of Proverbs, 'The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways,' the Septuagint reads, 'The Lord *created* me.' Hence the Arian conclusion

* *Adversus Hermogenem*, c. iii.

† *Adversus Praxean*, c. ix.

‡ *Adversus Judæos*, ii. c. i.

that the Son or Wisdom of God was created. We pass by Tertullian's well-known heresy of the corporeity of Deity and of the human soul. He explains this, indeed, so as to refute himself. Cyprian's rebaptizing of heretics was substantially the same heresy which afterwards made the schism of the Donatists. On other questions we might find many contradictions in the writings of the early Fathers, sometimes of each other and sometimes of themselves. On the great question of salvation, whether by works or by faith, which is still supposed to divide Catholics and Protestants, we may find the same diverse views in the Fathers that we find in the present day. The Roman Clement says that we are not justified by works but by faith.* The Alexandrian Father of the same name says that we may purchase heaven by 'our own resources.'† Any man who carefully studies the Fathers must come to the conclusion that the advice of Justin Martyr is safest, not to follow the ancients one step further than they are followers of truth.‡

The Church of Rome, as we have intimated, rests essentially on a secret tradition independent of the Scriptures. Cardinal Wiseman§ went so far as to identify this with a secret tradition which he supposed to have existed in the Jewish Church. This tradition, the Cardinal said, 'contained more vital dogmas than are written in the inspired volume.' It became the inheritance of the Catholic Church under Christianity, where it was more fully developed. The Catholic Church thus becomes a secret society, to which is

* Ad Corinthios Epistola Prior, c. xxxii. † Admonitio ad Græcos, c. ix.

‡ Apologia Prima, c. ii.

§ Lectures on the Catholic Church, p. 70.

committed a hidden mystery, deeper far than anything recorded by the pen of Evangelists or Apostles. Protestants stand aghast when they hear the claims of the Church of Rome, and yet they never seem to realise the boundless chasm between its pretensions and those of all other Churches. They cannot even believe that it professes to be a supernatural institution. They ask it, since it claims infallibility, to give an infallible exposition of the Scriptures, to settle the genuineness of some disputed books, to give a history of the canon, and explain why some books were accepted and some rejected. But those who make this demand forget that none of these things is really the necessary work of the Catholic Church. It professes to be a living organism, under no obligation even to be able to give a history of its past life.

It is unfortunate that a Church with such powers has no capacity of demonstrating them to the world. Dr. Wiseman lamented this, and could only find the reason of it in the inscrutable 'decrees of Eternal Providence.'* Men on the very verge of despair, conscious of the difficulties that beset them on every hand, examine the claims of the Church of Rome with the earnestness of life and death, but they find no ground on which for a moment they can rest the sole of the foot. They want a reason for faith, and they are told that the first step must be faith. Tertullian says that this is the custom of the Valentinian Gnostics; 'they persuade men before they instruct them, while truth persuades by teaching, but does not teach by

* Lectures on the Catholic Church, p. 297.

first persuading.’* Dr. Wiseman in the same way, on the ground of a secret tradition like that mentioned by the Valentinians, explains the Protestant method to be that of inquiry, but the Catholic that of ‘entire submission to the authority of the Church.’† To the same effect Dr. Newman argues that if a man is an inquirer he cannot be a believer, for by the very act of inquiry he has withheld what is necessary to constitute a Catholic, that is, assent.‡ At every point where the Church of Rome demands our assent it is not in virtue of a sufficient reason, but that we may be taught, and at every point where it claims to put forth supernatural power it keeps the evidence of the supernatural out of the reach of reason. In the daily miracle which it professes to work there are no signs to inform the senses or the reason of its reality. The bread has all the qualities of bread, and the wine of wine. The consciousness of the faithful making, by a natural law, the ideal into a real, often supposes the presence of flesh and blood, and in some cases the transformation is said to have been visible, but the miracle in this form is rarely credited even by Catholics. We want a test of the Church’s infallibility, but it is found nowhere. The Church refuses to settle any question that may be proposed to it concerning any problem of history or science, or to shed light on any of the hard and perplexing questions of daily life. Even on subjects on which it does speak, it gives no certainty that it has spoken the right word. The evidence of its supernatural power is not

* *Adversus Valentinianos*, c. 1.

† P. 27.

‡ *Grammar of Assent*, p. 184.

only beyond the province of that reason which investigates, but the power itself is rendered doubtful by its own voluntary acts. The Councils which claim to represent the Church have all shown the usual measure of human frailty, and the Popes, by the admission of Catholics themselves, have not been free from the infirmities common to man.

All these things, and many more, have long been in the way of earnest men believing the Church of Rome to be what it professes to be. But the events connected with the recent Council of the Vatican have raised a new and impassable barrier in the way of any man who wishes his assent to be preceded by investigation. We do not speak merely of the new dogma. That in itself is the same in kind with other dogmas. If it is a novelty, if it is contradicted by facts, if the programme was imposed in the Council, the same might be said of other dogmas which the Church has decreed in other ages. It is an old taunt against Protestants that their 'variations' of doctrine are many—even one of the old Fathers reproached the heretics that they all differed from each other. But now we have a new revelation of 'variations' within the fold of the united Catholic Church. 'The Lucifer of Christendom has thus far fallen from his pride of place, and become as one of us.'* But it is not a mere question of variations. It is now evident that the great leaders and champions of Catholicism are at variance as to the very essence of Catholicism. They have not all understood the secret tradition which

* Dean of Westminster in *Edinburgh Review*, 'The Vatican Council,' July, 1871.

makes the Church independent of Scripture and Fathers. Some supposed that the Church rested entirely on the past, but it is found that it has a life independent of the past. It is possible, it is even probable, that celebrated Catholics who have boasted so much about the tradition of the Church had no definite idea of what they meant by this tradition. We have seen Dr. Wiseman comparing and identifying it with the tradition of the Jews, by which they knew of such doctrines as the immortality of the soul which were not revealed in the canonical Scriptures. But Dr. Wiseman again tells us that the 'unwritten word' of the Church is written in the Fathers. If a difficulty were to arise about any doctrine, and the Church thought it necessary to define what is held, 'the method,' he says, 'would be to examine most accurately the writings of the Fathers of the Church, to ascertain what, in different countries and different ages, was by them held, and then collecting the suffrages of all the world and of all times—not indeed to create a new article of faith, but to define what has already been the faith of the Catholic Church. It is concluded in every instance as a matter of historical inquiry, and all human prudence is used to arrive at a judicious conclusion.'" * No man can undertake to say beforehand what a Roman Catholic may do in reference to his Church, but if Dr. Wiseman had lived to see the Vatican Council he would have found that dogmas are not made by a careful examination of the Fathers, but by votes of the majority of bishops. And the Council was wise in its generation. The

* Lectures on the Catholic Church, p. 61.

infallibility of the Pope was as little known to the Fathers as the adventures of Robinson Crusoe, or the history of Sinbad the Sailor.

In England the new dogma was regarded by many who had gone from the Church of England as a calamity to the Catholic Church. Dr. Newman, who had left the Church of England after he was persuaded that the Fathers were on the side of the Church of Rome, prayed to Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Basil, that they would arrest 'the great calamity;' but these saints were either asleep, or they had gone on a journey. And so an 'insolent faction,' as Dr. Newman called the promoters of the new dogma, were allowed to postpone the 'triumph' of the Catholic Church. Mr. Maskell, another pervert, who found Anglo-Catholicism unsupported by the Fathers, adduced the 'practice of the whole Catholic Church, for scores of generations, that the Pope alone was not infallible.*' Mr. Maskell, evidently at his wits' end, and finding the same uncertainty in the Church of Rome that he had found in the Church of England, has since submitted, with the understanding that, 'if a Pope contradicted any clear article of faith, he would, instead of being infallible in so doing, *ipso facto* cease to be Pope.' In Germany, where the Catholic clergy may lay claim to greater learning than in any other country, the new dogma met the greatest opposition. The opposition bishops have since submitted, not because they are convinced of the truth of the Vatican decrees, but for the sake of peace and not to break the unity of the

* A Letter to the Editor of the *Dublin Review*.

Church. They are convinced that an Œcumenical Council has proclaimed a false doctrine, yet they either explain it in an unnatural sense, or they submit to it for the sake of peace. This is the certainty, this is the unity, this is the concord of the Catholic Church! Dr. Döllinger, the greatest champion of Catholicism in modern times, a man to whom the whole history of the Church is as familiar as the events of the passing hour, cannot conceal the fact, even from himself, that the Catholic Church which he has defended is not the Church represented by the Vatican Council. He understood by this Catholic Church a society which could show identity of doctrine with the Church of past ages; but the majority of the members of the Council meant a supernatural institution, whose decree alone was greater evidence of truth than all history. In France, where the denial of Papal infallibility had long been a characteristic of the National Church, there were still some who saw in the proceedings of the Vatican Council the destruction of what they had always regarded as the Catholic Church. Père Hyacinthe has remained faithful to his convictions; but it is to be feared that the bishops and leaders of the clergy have renounced their national traditions, and submitted to receive from Rome what in their own consciences they know to be false. The Catholicism which Bossuet defended is no longer Catholicism, and the great champion of the faith is himself deprived of the name of Catholic.*

* As a specimen how French Catholics regarded Ultramontanes before the decision of the Vatican, we quote from the Abbé de Saint-Pol, in his criticism of the sayings and doings of Archbishop Manning: 'L'école extrême dont l'Archevêque de Westminster se fait, en Angleterre, l'organe et l'apôtre,

But the 'variations' of Catholicism are really nothing new to Protestants. Bossuet himself would not have been ignorant of them had he not wilfully shut his eyes. No Catholic can be ignorant of them who is familiar with Augustine, whose views of grace were declared by Pope Hormisdas to be the doctrine of the Catholic Church.* M. Simon had shown † that on the subject of grace the Church had never been united. The same diverse sentiments that divided Protestants into Calvinists and Arminians have existed from very early times in the Christian Church. This is a matter so easily tested that any ordinary man has only to read Augustine on predestination, and compare what he says with Chrysostom's exposition of the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. Here we have the two representative fathers of the East and the West. Augustine is plainly on

coupe en deux, si l'on peut ainsi dire, l'Eglise universelle; elle sépare le chef des membres; elle mutile l'œuvre de Jésus-Christ; elle opère une véritable décapitation! Si de pareilles tendances pouvaient prévaloir, l'heure ne serait pas éloignée où l'Eglise, déposée des conditions essentielles de sa véritable vie, tomberait dans un malaise incurable, dans un étoilement chronique, qui aboutiraient fatalement à la mort! Mais les promesses sont certaines Jésus-Christ ne manquera pas à son Eglise, et les tendances nouvelles ne prévaudront pas.' ('L'Ultra-Catholicisme en Angleterre,' par M. l'Abbé A. de Saint-Pol.)

This was written before the new dogma was proclaimed, so that, according to the Abbé, the promises of Christ have failed. The Church has received an incurable wound. Dr. Dollinger used the same words to the present writer last summer. 'The Catholic Church,' he said, 'has received a wound which it cannot survive.' The same Abbé recognising the vast difference between the Catholicism of Manning and Bossuet, exclaims in another page: 'Notre grand Bossuet, le défenseur le plus dévoué, le champion le plus opiniâtre des droits certains et des privilèges légitimes du Saint-Siège, Bossuet lui-même n'est pas épargné! Ni son immortel génie, ni son immense amour de l'Eglise n'ont pas lui faire trouver grâce devant les sévérités cruelles de Mgr. Manning!'

* See Bossuet 'Défense de la Tradition et des Saints Pères,' p. 265, vol. v., of the Versailles edition of his works.

† 'Histoire Critique des Principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Testament,' &c., par M. Simon.

the side of Calvin, while Chrysostom makes election to depend on the divine fore-knowledge of the persons elected. God foresaw that Jacob was to be a good man, therefore God loved him ; while Esau was hated because of his foreseen wickedness. Augustine denies free-will, Chrysostom defends it. Augustine compares the elect and the reprobate to two malefactors. Because of Adam's sin they are under condemnation. God pardons one, but suffers the law to be executed on the other. He cannot escape, for he never receives that grace which is necessary to repentance. He sins indeed, but he came into the world so influenced by Adam's transgression that he could do nothing but sin, and for this sin he is reprobated for ever. Chrysostom, on the other hand, supposes all men to be so far restored by grace, that their final standing or falling depends on themselves. The doctrine of Chrysostom is now unquestionably that of the Church of Rome, while the doctrine of Augustine was condemned in the condemnation of the Jansenists. Roman Catholics try to escape these conclusions by refined distinctions. They deny the identity of the doctrine of Augustine with that of Jansen in the same way as Pascal, a Jansenist, to save himself from the charge of heresy, tried to distinguish between the doctrine of Jansen and that of Calvin, by professing to rely on Augustine. The plea was that grace effectually disposed the will without interfering with its freedom,* which is simply the explanation of irresistible grace that we hear every day from the disciples of Calvin. This system of theology in spite

* 'Lettres Provinciales,' No. xvii.

of all efforts to make distinctions, is altogether different from the theology now sanctioned in the Church of Rome. The Rhemes commentators, for instance, say that 'the pardoned work by their own free-will, and thereby deserve their salvation, and the other no less by their own free-will of themselves procure their own damnation.'* The Council of Trent decreed, 'Whosoever shall affirm that all works done before justification, in whatsoever way performed, are actually sins, and deserve God's hatred; or that the more earnestly a man labours to dispose himself for grace, he does but sin the more, let him be accursed;' and again, 'Whosoever shall affirm that the ungodly is justified by faith only, so that it is to be understood that nothing else is to be required to co-operate therewith in order to obtain salvation, and that it is on no account necessary that he should prepare and dispose himself by the effect of his own will, let him be accursed.' We are not passing any judgment on this doctrine in itself, but no unbiassed mind could ever pronounce it the doctrine of Augustine. The decrees were evidently made with special reference to the Augustinian theology of the Protestant Confessions, and were probably expressly aimed at the Calvinistic Articles of the Church of England.

We cannot shut our eyes to these facts. They render it impossible for rational men to believe in the supernatural character of the Church of Rome. We look for evidence, but at every step we find traces of error and infirmity. Dr. Newman still adheres to the Church of Rome, though the 'insolent faction,' as he

* The Rhemes New Testament, note on Romans ix.

once called the Ultramontanes, have now made a complete conquest of the entire Church. He continues to write books for the benefit of Protestants, and such is our esteem for Newman, that if he really had an argument to offer, he would have a more respectful hearing than any Catholic in England. But he only gives us dialectics, subtle distinctions which we are disposed to question, and conclusions in favour of the religion he has adopted, which scarcely follow even from his questionable premises. He tells us for instance that the religion of England is notional, while that of Catholics is real; the one is only a sentiment, the other founded on an assent, a conviction, or realisation of the object of faith. What he means may not be altogether evident, for he excepts all the great religious movements, and all the men who have had a great religious influence, in England. Protestant piety is certainly different in type from Catholic piety; but the distinction of notional and real is altogether inapplicable. The Catholic has perhaps a deeper sense of the supernatural, for he believes a supernatural working in his daily worship, but the Protestant has a deeper faith. He sees God in the daily working of nature and Providence, and in spite of many difficulties he trusts on. The feeling of certainty is often as strong, but it is internal certainty, and this may be a supernatural work in a higher sense than what Dr. Newman means by the real assent of a Catholic.

It is to the credit both of Dr. Newman and Dr. Manning that they have never allowed their Catholic zeal to do injustice to the religious worth and moral influence of Protestantism in England. Our nationally

practical character would lead us to look favourably on the Church of Rome if its fruits were visibly better than those of Protestantism. We expect that a supernatural Church would produce better and higher results than a Church which does not claim that character. If the population of Roman Catholic countries showed any moral superiority to our own population, we should be willing to take this as so much evidence of the truth of Catholicism. But for this we look in vain. The same humanity is in all countries, and the same varieties of good and evil which are often determined in a greater measure by other circumstances than the mere presence of either Protestantism or Catholicism. 'There are,' says Dr. Manning, 'in the Anglican communion, and among Nonconformists, millions who believe in Jesus Christ, His person, and His redemption, with a heartfelt and loving faith, and their faith bears noble fruit.'* On the other hand, Dr. Newman says that in a Catholic community there may be all the vices to which a Protestant community are liable. There may be scandals in monasteries, officials in cathedrals who are a dishonour to the place, and priests who set a bad example to their flocks, and are the cause of anxiety and grief to their bishops.† When we compare the fruits of the two religions we find no such balance in favour of the Catholic Church as to become an evidence of its supernatural character. Mr. Ffoulkes and Mr. Capes left the Church of England expecting to find more of heaven upon earth in the Church of Rome. Like many others, they were

* 'The Œcumenical Council,' a pastoral letter, p. 10.

† 'Anglican Difficulties,' p. 227.

disappointed. They have both returned, and published to the world that they found the tone and practice of morality not so high in Catholic countries as in Protestant England. And even the religious tone seems in some cases to be lower than in England. Mr. Ffoulkes says that when he described to the priest who received him into communion on the continent the 'daily round' of Christian life in the Church of England,—'our family prayers, our grace before and after meals, our reading of the Scriptures, our observance of Sunday, our services at Church, our Sunday-schools,'—the priest, on the following Sunday, embodied it all in a fervent sermon, telling his congregation how 'many lessons of piety they had to learn from their separated brethren in England.'*

When we try to gather from Roman Catholic writers what are the real advantages of their Church, we find them in many cases such as we reckon no advantages at all. Dr. Newman and Dr. Manning both tell us that the great work of the Church is to fight against the spirit of the age, in fact, to make war against the divine progress of the world. This, too, the Vatican Council has declared in no ambiguous or doubtful language. The old spirit of the Manichees seems to have taken possession of the Catholic Church. It has given up the world of nature to the dominion of the adversary, and seeks to cast out the evil one by magic and divination. The sacraments are made charms, and when we say that the difference between a Catholic and a Protestant population is not visible, we are told that the Catholic has 'the grace of baptism,

* 'The Church's Creed and the Crown's Creed,' by E. S. Ffoulkes, p. 50.

the germ or power of all supernatural virtues.* Again, Dr. Newman tells us that Catholics 'worship the crucifix,' however profligate they may be. A Catholic may be a highwayman, but he is devout to the Madonna. He may swear by the 'Blessed Mother,' but he pays for his mass, and if he be a wicked peasant any one can put him to flight by a 'Hail Mary, holy water, or the sign of the cross.' An old woman who 'genueflects before the Blessed Sacrament' and then steals her neighbour's handkerchief is still 'a believer.' A Catholic 'may sing jocose songs about the Blessed Virgin and the saints,'† and in levity tell good stories about the devil; he may neglect his Easter duties, laugh at the priest, and cease going to mass; but when he is dying, 'he addresses himself to the crucifix, interests the Blessed Virgin in his behalf,' gets absolution from his priest, and dies in the faith. This is the superiority; this is the advantage of Catholicism over Protestantism.‡ Let a wicked man give what Dr. Newman calls a 'real assent' to the Catholic religion, and he is 'safer' than a Protestant whose life is irreproachable. This principle, too, is inherited from Paganism. The Pagans preferred men, however profligate, if they adhered to the old religion, to any Christians, however good their lives might be.§

'Judicat securus orbis terrarum,' St. Augustine wrote when he reckoned up the Christians throughout

* Dr. Newman's 'Anglican Difficulties,' p. 226.

† The same religious phenomenon is noted in the 'Octavius' of Minutius Felix: 'Etiam per quietans deos videmus, audimus, agnoscimus, quos impie per diem negamus, nolumus, pejeramus.'

‡ 'Anglican Difficulties,' pp. 230—42.

§ See Tertullian's 'Apology,' c. iii.

the world, and put them in the scales against the Donatists of the north of Africa. It was beautiful rhetoric, and when it rung in Dr. Newman's ears he could not resist its charms. The intellect of the great dialectician had become so childlike that it was

‘Pleased with a feather, tickled with a straw.’

It was a great leap in Augustine to suppose that the Church in his day was co-extensive with the world, and a greater leap still to suppose that it had a judgment at all, much less a unanimous judgment, on the question which caused the separation of the Donatists. Moreover, the Donatists might have answered on the principle of Vincentius of Lerina, that when the greater part was corrupted they were to appeal to antiquity; and they could have appealed to their own Cyprian, to the great Council of Carthage, and to the tradition of the African Church. Certainly in their case, in theory at least, reason and Christian charity were on the side of Augustine and the Roman Church. The argument, however, though one of numbers, was founded on a principle which has truth in it. The general judgment or Catholic reason of mankind may not be infallible. It may not be always the same, yet it must always be a check upon the individual reason. In the surroundings of the common reason that of the individual is most likely to receive its normal development. In the common thoughts of the race and the common experience of mankind we are more likely to find such truth as may be known than in the decisions of Popes and Councils. This is the true Catholic faith. This is the universal Church of which all men are

members in virtue of their being born into the world.

It is well for Protestants to see clearly how entire is their dissent from the whole theory of the Church of Rome. That Church supposes faith to be measured by the assent given to its dogmas. Faith is reckoned greater the less the evidence for the truth of what the Church teaches, and by this kind of faith 'the soul is to be saved.' Dr. Newman seems to be possessed by the conviction that the more he believes, and the less ground he has for believing it, the more acceptable will he be in the sight of God. In this kind of faith, and in prayer and ceremonies founded on it, the Catholic, departing entirely from the universal reason, places the substance of religion. The Protestant, on the other hand, measures his assent to any doctrine by the amount of evidence which it carries with it. There is a Hindoo legend that when the Supreme Deity first essayed creation, He made ten men who did nothing but praise Brahma. It might have been supposed that this was the most commendable thing for men to do; but the legend adds that they were such idiots that Brahma immediately destroyed them, and created in their place a race of rational beings. The service which the Deity wants is a reasonable service. The Protestant recognises the mysteries by which he is surrounded, but he strives to see in nature a divine order, and to learn what is his present duty. His faith is not an 'assent,' but a trust. He believes that since there is so much wisdom in what he now sees, there will at last be found no less wisdom in that which is dark and full of mystery. The faith of

Catholics is like that of Job's friends. They profess certainty at every step. They cannot suppose that the Divine Being would suffer anything to be otherwise than as they imagine it to be. But the faith of the Protestant is like that of Job admitting the dark where it is dark, marvelling at God's incomprehensible ways, yet believing that after the clouds there will be sunshine, and that His dealings with men will be according to a wisdom that is boundless and a justice that is infinite.

XVIII.

AN EARNEST MINISTER.*

ONLY a small number of our readers have ever heard of the Rev. John Milne, of Perth; and but for the circumstance that he was for some years the successor of Dr. Duff at Calcutta, that number would have been smaller still. Yet Mr. Milne in his own way was a rare man. About thirty years ago there was in some towns in Scotland what is called a 'great revival' of religion. It began with a young preacher named William Burns, and it was carried on with the assistance of Mr. Milne, of Perth; Mr. M'Cheyne, of Dundee; and some other ministers of less note. M'Cheyne died in his youth. He had often prayed that he might depart and be with Christ, for that, he said, was far better. His prayer was early answered. William Burns, with a strange heroism, left the work he was doing in Scotland and became a laborious missionary among the Chinese. He died in the early part of last year, not much over fifty years of age. Two

* Contemporary Review, March, 1869.

Life of the Rev. John Milne, of Perth. By HORATIUS BONAR, D.D. London: James Nisbet & Co.

months later died Mr. Milne, who had been minister of St. Leonard's, Perth, from 1839 up to 1853, Dr. Duff's successor in Calcutta from that time till 1858, and for the last ten years minister again of his old congregation in Perth.

The 'revival' took place about three years before the disruption in the Church of Scotland, when the ministers were sharply divided into Evangelicals and Moderates. Mr. Milne and his friends belonged to the former. They were not only excluded from the pulpits, and by the parochial law of 'use and wont' from the parishes of the Moderates, but their 'revival' doings subjected them to strict presbyterial examinations, and to the usual measure of public criticism and censure. The writer of this can remember William Burns preaching in St. Leonard's, Perth, and the strange influence he had over the people. There was no noise, and, saving the soft accents of the preacher's voice, with here and there a subdued sobbing, the silence was breathless and deathlike. Crowds flocked to the church every evening, and often when the preacher had finished and retired to the vestry, the people remained. He had to return and continue the service sometimes till past the hour of midnight. The whole town was excited, and all the neighbourhood for miles round. There were prayer-meetings in every street. Tracts were distributed at every corner, servant girls were discoursing seriously to each other about being 'saved,' and little boys were singing psalms and holding prayer-meetings by the road-sides, under hedgerows and in sand-pits. There was much evil mingled with all this. People were using language which expressed

what they did not feel, and were making professions beyond their actual experience. But it was here as in all other 'revivals'—the good is known chiefly to those who have experienced it, while the evil is manifest to all men. The excitement passed away. There had been stony-ground hearers, and some of the seed fell among thorns. But some also fell on good ground and brought forth good fruit.

The story of Mr. Milne's life is soon told. He was a gentle, amiable boy, whose highest ambition was to be a 'minister.' In his school days he found his pleasure in his lessons rather than in play. He was sent to the University of Aberdeen, where his industry gained him the highest prizes in classics and mathematics. Before beginning his ministry he came to Richmond as tutor to the family of a Mr. Snow, a clergyman of the Church of England. Under Mr. Snow's preaching his religious feelings deepened. It was here, he says, that he passed from 'darkness to light.' He thought of taking orders in the Church of England; but on further study of the question of Church polity, he decided for Presbyterianism. Returning to Aberdeen in 1835, he was appointed to a Sunday evening lectureship, which he held till 1839, when he came to Perth.

St. Leonard's Church is what is called in Scotland a *quoad sacra*—that is, a district church without parsonage or endowment. William Burns was with Mr. Milne at the very beginning of his Perth ministry. The church soon filled. The pews were all taken, and a long list was kept in the vestry of the names of persons waiting for vacancies. Mr. Milne's heart was in

his work in right earnest. He gave himself wholly to it, and the people clung to him with a devotion which no earthly power could change. It was a time of trouble in the Church of Scotland. The question of patronage, or the right of the patron to intrude his *présentée* on a parish against the will of the people—that withering evil of all State Churches—was rending the Church asunder. How it ended in 1843 is a matter of history; but only those who witnessed the strife can have any conception of the wrath, the malice, and bitterness which accompanied it. Ministers, parishes, families, were divided; and for a time the Gospel was not peace, but a sword. Perth has often been closely connected with great religious questions. It was here that John Knox began the Reformation. It was here that Ebenezer Erskine began the Secession in the early part of the last century, and on this same question of the abuse of patronage. In 1842 Perth was one of the strongholds of the Non-Intrusionists. Mr. Milne was a decided Free Churchman, but never mingled in the strife. He was firm when the hour came, and went forth bravely to do as conscience dictated, followed by almost his entire congregation; but he never reproached the ministers that remained in the Establishment, and they never reproached him. Each party ascribed to the other the most unworthy motives; but no one ever questioned the integrity, the sincerity, and the disinterestedness of John Milne. This was a rare triumph of the spirit of Christ in the man.

In 1847, in the fortieth year of his age, Mr. Milne married. It was scarcely expected that a soul so

sublimated would ever have so far conformed to that vile world, which eats and drinks, marries and is given in marriage. But the holiness of celibacy was not an article of his creed. After five years of great domestic happiness and great prosperity in his work, one of his children died, then his wife died, and, soon after, his other child died, and his house was left desolate. The entry in his family Bible of his marriage and the deaths of his wife and children is very affecting. 'The Lord,' he said, 'setteth the solitary in families, and He makes them solitary again.' He found many words of Scripture to express his grief and to describe his feelings; for all Scripture, if rightly taken, is truly human; but his humanity shines out in the words of Tennyson, with which he concludes:—

'Better to have loved and lost
Than never to have loved at all.'

The immediate result of this bereavement is a conviction that he is called to India. But how is he to know that the call is really divine? He consults his brethren, who mostly try to persuade him that he is not called. 'The simple fact is,' said Andrew Gray, one of his oldest and most trusted friends, '*you took it into your head, and so the thing began.*' The congregation were opposed to it, every man and every woman of them. All entreated him not to leave them, not to break a bond so close, not to leave work in which he had so eminently prospered, and to which he was so evidently called. But Mr. Milne was resolved for India, and he could only answer them, 'What mean ye to weep and to break my heart?' And to India he went. Here he married again. His wife's

health failed, and after nearly five years of Indian work he returned to Scotland, and was again called to be the minister of Free St. Leonard's. Since that time he had been a leader of 'great revivals of religion;' but whether or not these 'revivals' were genuine, we have not the means of forming an impartial judgment.

Mr. Milne was not an 'intellectual' preacher. He did not understand 'doubts' or 'difficulties of belief.' He felt none of these himself, and could only regard them in others as the 'fruits of sin.' He was so far out of sympathy with what we call the wants of the age, that but for the single fact that his ministry was successful, we should not have thought his biography deserving more than the briefest notice. He was eminent, Dr. Bonar says, as a pastor, a minister, and an evangelist. He knew all his congregation familiarly—every member of every family. He had conversed and prayed privately with almost every one, introducing them to that spiritual region in which his own life was passed. He was always and everywhere 'the minister;' never for a moment forgetting his calling, and never forgetting that every moment he was exercising influence. His sermons were simple, earnest, and always studied with the circumstances and wants of his congregation before his mind. He never used a manuscript or notes, and an ordinary hearer might have thought that he was speaking without preparation; but he made too much conscience of his work to do any of it negligently. All the week was spent in preparing for the Sunday. He prayed, he read, he wrote, he meditated, he gathered spiritual

strength every day, and what he gathered he gave to his people when Sunday came. The work of ministering to a large congregation was enough in itself for any ordinary man, but Mr. Milne's zeal knew no limits. He never refused invitations to preach for his neighbours. He went out on missionary tours, holding 'revival' meetings, preaching in barns, or in the open air, or to the workpeople in factories. He never missed an opportunity of trying to do good. If travelling in a railway carriage, he would engage the passengers in religious conversation. If he hired a cab, he would speak to the cabman about being 'saved.' If he saw a poor woman carrying a basket, he would offer to help her, saying, that we ought to bear one another's burdens. If a man begged from him, he would give a coin, and tell him to 'beg for his soul.' To fishermen mending their nets he would say that he too was a fisherman, and he wished to catch men. To stone-breakers he would say that he was a stone-breaker, trying to break stony hearts. He would often accompany the policemen in their night rounds, and with the help of the lantern read to them verses out of the New Testament. He has been known to travel amid the smoke and soot of a railway engine, that he might 'convert' the stoker. He would tell boys selling newspapers that he had a newspaper that never grew old, meaning his Bible. When he saw any one in mourning, he would go up to them, speak of their bereavement, say that he sympathized with them, and so did Christ. When the Queen came to Perth to uncover a statue of Prince Albert, Mr. Milne was anxious that she should receive some spiritual benefit

at his hands. He wished to present her with a copy of a favourite hymn. He found no opportunity of doing it personally, but Lord Mansfield introduced him to General Grey, who assured Mr. Milne that the hymn would be presented to the Queen. When Mr. Milne went to India, he began his work as soon as he was on board ship. He conversed with the passengers, held meetings with them, and preached to them. He watched for opportunities of speaking to the seamen. He gave the boys sixpences to learn verses of the Scriptures, and he even succeeded in getting the captain to join with him in private prayer. In Calcutta he visited through the lanes and gullies of the old town—a place unknown to most of the European population. He made his way into several families, in spite of what he called ‘worldly etiquette,’ when he knew they were in trouble, or on the occasion of sickness or death. Many a time, now more than twenty years ago, did Mr. Milne stop the writer of this on Perth Bridge, on the North Inch, or by the river side, look at his bundle of books, and ask how he was getting on with Ovid, or Virgil, or Homer. Then would follow an invitation to his Bible class. His manner was so simple, his character so transparent, that as soon as he spoke it was evident he had but one object.

We have said that Mr. Milne’s ministry was successful. He had no great gifts of intellect; he had no eloquence; his learning was not extensive; in fact, his reading seems to have been unusually limited. What, then, was the secret of his power? We might say at once it was that he preached religion rather than theology; and he lived what he preached. If he

did not know the difficulties that beset men who think, he yet knew the wants of men in general. He knew the power of sympathy, and he knew that the story of the life and the death of Jesus will reach men's hearts to the end of time. And then he had mastered the evil that was in himself. No one ever knew him to be angry. Even his wife could only once remember any approach to hastiness, and it was when the servant had omitted to tell him of a case of sickness to be visited. He could bear opposition; he could suffer to see himself despised or thrust aside if any good came by it. He used to buy things at a shop in Perth where the shopkeeper was not civil to him. He was asked why he continued to go where his custom was not wanted; and he answered that he was trying to soften that man by kindness. He could not enter into the thoughts of men who are perplexed with the ways of Providence, or have doubts about revelation, or who do not understand revelation in the same way as he understood it; but he did not rail against them as atheists, infidels, neologians, or sceptics. He knew that men were not to be won by hard names. Nor did he speak evil of Christians who did not belong to his own party. Writing to a servant in England who had been a member of his congregation, he said, 'You must not despise the Church of England. If I know the Lord at all, it was in her that He was first revealed to me.' In India he sometimes preached in the chapels belonging to the Church of England, getting a civilian or an officer to read the liturgy. His religion was not made up of certain opinions; it was a *life*.

It appears that in his youth Mr. Milne had a fall

which affected his head. How far this served as a thorn in the flesh to crucify him to the world we do not know. His zeal often seemed to surpass the bounds of reason. He refused to go into society where he could not make religion the sole subject of conversation. He was out of sympathy with what is secular or 'worldly.' In some company, when a favourite Scotch song was sung, beginning 'There's nae luck about the house,' Mr. Milne said it was only true of King Jesus, to whom also all the Jacobite songs were applicable. To little boys in the street he would speak of a little boy in Germany who wrote a letter to the 'dear Lord Jesus.' Walking in a friend's garden, he found the gardener lamenting that the frost was destroying the strawberries; he took the gardener into the summer-house and prayed for a good season. He lived in daily expectation of the second advent. Mr. Milne was one of those happy souls over whose head heaven is still open, and the angels of God ascending and descending. The Bible was to him a book of which every letter is divine, and all its figures realities. His faith was that of a child—as simple, as sincere, as living, as earnest. While reading Mr. Milne's Life we have been thinking of another man very unlike him, and yet in some respects very like. This is no other than Jacob Böhme, the shoemaking philosopher of Gorlitz. When Böhme's hour of departure was at hand, he called his son Tobias, and asked him whether he heard that sweet harmonious music? He replied, 'No.' 'Open the door,' said he, 'that you may the better hear it.' And asking what o'clock it was, he told him it was two. 'My

time,' he said, 'is not yet; three hours hence is my time.' Then he spoke these words,—'O Thou strong God of Sabaoth, deliver me according to Thy will! Thou crucified Lord Jesus, have mercy on me and take me into Thy kingdom!' When six in the morning came, he took leave of his wife and son, blessed them, and said, 'Now I go hence into Paradise;' and bidding his son turn him, he fetched a sigh and departed. We say of John Milne, in the words of Professor Maurice, 'We may be glad, like Böhme's son Tobias, to open the door and see whether any of the music which soothed him on his deathbed can reach us. Without adopting any of his speculations, we may be thankful if our pilgrimage is as honest and as toilsome as his was, our faith of the way which has been opened into Paradise as well-grounded and as child-like.'

XIX.

THE EDUCATION OF THE CLERGY.*

IT has often been remarked that there are no clergy in the world so well educated as those of the Church of England; and yet there are none whose education has so little reference to the special duties of their profession. The study of theology, with the sacred languages and literature, is almost entirely neglected, or at the most extends only to attendance on one or two short courses of routine lectures. A student destined for the Church is scarcely ever called upon to write sermons or homilies until the bishop's examination, and his first effort at reading or speaking in public is not until after he has taken deacon's orders. The result is that the clergyman as a public teacher, is unable, with all his education, to compete with the most uneducated preacher that harangues in the neighbouring Bethel or Bethesda. These are facts admitted alike by all parties in the Church, and out of it. Mr. Michell compares the education of the English clergy with that of the Roman Catholic clergy

* Contemporary Review, October, 1868.

Notes and Thoughts on the Education of the Clergy at Home and Abroad, and on the Scarcity of Candidates for Holy Orders. By WILLIAM MICHELL, M.A., Incumbent of Chantry. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

in France and the Protestant Episcopal clergy in the United States. The chief thing which distinguishes the French and American clerical education from that of England is its exclusively ecclesiastical character. In France the priests are mostly selected from the humbler classes; they are marked out for the priesthood while mere boys, and sent to schools and colleges where they undergo a long course of training before they are admitted to full orders. The Church never loses sight of them. They are watched over in youth. They are specially cared for at the time of their ordination, and as young priests the bishop finds them employment according to their capabilities and their particular gifts. In England the whole condition, education, and relation of the clergy is the entire reverse of this. As a rule they come from the middle and higher classes of society. They are sent to the great public schools and universities, where they mix with those of their own age who are destined for other professions or for no profession at all. They pursue the same studies, indulge in the same sports, and fall into the same sins as their fellow-students. Their testimonials are signed, as a matter of course. Their *si quis* is read, to which no one pays any attention. They are examined by the bishop—an examination which is often the merest imaginable pretence; they are ordained, and go to work in their parishes, often to preach a Gospel which they have never learned, to expound Scriptures which they have never studied, and to address, as consolation to the sick and dying, words that would bring no consolation to themselves. Should they have the means of reaching

a benefice, the bishop will make a further acquaintance with them ; but should they remain curates they are too insignificant for his lordship to take further notice of them either for good or for evil. A French bishop, according to Mr. Michell, knows all his clergy ; and when a rector wants a curate, he applies to the bishop. In England all these things are done by means of registry offices, advertisements in ecclesiastical newspapers, and sometimes by agents, who get a percentage for their work. If a curate were to ask an English bishop to help him to find a curacy, he would receive a polite answer saying that a memorandum had been made of his request. He would never, of course, hear from the bishop again ; in fact, the episcopal answer would be written with a coldness which intimated that not being a beneficed clergyman, the bishop did not consider him as particularly belonging to his diocese, or indeed to the Church at all. We cannot advocate the Roman Catholic system of training the clergy in schools and colleges where they are shut out from all intercourse with the actual world. They may thus become more devoted servants of the Church, but not of mankind. No man requires more universality of knowledge and experience than the religious teacher. He should be physician, philosopher, and farmer, as well as pastor and preacher. Some vague idea of this is at the foundation of the system which makes the education of an English clergyman a secular rather than a theological education ; but it is deficient in two ways—it never reaches the ideal, and it fails even of the good which the other system ensures. It might be said, speaking

generally, that the Catholic education of the clergy is part of the Catholic system—the training of men who are to live celibate lives, whose sympathies are not to be with the world, but whose will, reason, and intellect, body, soul, and spirit, are given up to the service of the Church as an institution. The Protestant clerical education is necessarily different, and ought to be; yet we agree with Mr. Michell that there is great room for improvement, and for improvement, too, in no way incompatible with the Protestant character of the Church of England.

But the evils of which we have to complain are not isolated. We can trace their connection with other and higher evils, which bear relation to them as causes to effects. And this brings us to the second part of Mr. Michell's pamphlet—the scarcity of candidates for holy orders. It seems at first sight a strange fact that in the richest Church in the world, the Church in which the clergy are held in the highest honour, and which gives them the highest social position, there is not found a sufficient number of properly qualified men to come into her service and do the work which her very existence requires to be done. Mr. Michell assigns for this a great many reasons. The principal of them, we think, may be reduced to two. The first is the expense of education. It is almost impossible for any but the monied class to get the advantages of Oxford or Cambridge. This excludes all the material from which the Churches in all other countries, Catholic or Protestant, derive their clergy. This makes the Church more aristocratic, doubtless; but what right has a national Church to

separate itself from the largest class in the nation? And what is the consequence? Just as the humbler classes are not represented in the service of the Church, so are they absent from its worship. It is true the bishops can ordain 'literate persons,' and there are clerical colleges where the necessary training is within the reach of men who cannot afford the expense of the universities. Yet these colleges are mostly failures. St. Aidan's has been closed. St. Bees, the oldest of them, has been brought into disgrace by the incapacity of the men whom it has sent to the Bishops' Examinations. Some of the others are mere schools for training men in party principles, imitated from the Catholic seminaries. They are unable to do the necessary service for the Church. This, also, is worth inquiring into, and the reason will be found in connection with something else. When it is said that St. Bees has been a failure, a question immediately follows, Has the Church been just towards St. Bees? Is it not the custom to despise even good, well qualified, yes, and able men, because they have been at St. Bees? Moreover, while the great colleges where only the wealthy can go, are richly endowed, St. Bees, which is to educate a class more in need of assistance, is left to depend on the fees paid by the students. Now the establishment must be supported; and granting that the principal and tutors had consciences as tender as those of saints or seraphim, yet the temptation is there to give the most hopeless man a trial. And no easy or desirable responsibility can it be to decide among such a heterogeneous gathering of men as may be seen at a clerical college,—Welshmen, some

of them fresh from the national school, after two years' training, to be sent back for the edification of the prosperous Episcopal Church in the Principality; officers tired of the army; sailors weary of the navy; surgeons sick of their profession; schoolmasters bent on improving their position in the world; Dissenting ministers renouncing heresy and denouncing schism; Wesleyan local preachers whose hopes lay in another direction till the decision of the last Conference; shopkeepers that have failed in business; adventurers that have travelled the world over, tried everything, and got tired of everything, but are now at last seeking repose in the bosom of mother Church; with perhaps one or two self-taught working men, struggling against fearful odds, it may be only to rise in the world, or it may be earnestly to consecrate themselves to the service of religion. Only a few of this multitude should ever be admitted to orders; but there are men among them whose services it would be a pity to lose. It is not, we repeat, the fault of the college that a better class of men are not produced. It is the fault of the Church and its rulers that the college is not better encouraged and better patronised. If it were endowed, and more distinctly and fully recognised as a Church institution, it would get better material and be able to send out better men. But the whole spirit of the Church is opposed to the education of the clergy anywhere but in the universities. Many of the bishops will not ordain a man who has not taken a degree at Oxford or Cambridge. Many incumbents will not employ a curate who is not a member of one of the universi-

ties. The counterpart of 'No Irish need apply,' is often appended to an advertisement for a curate by the incumbent of some miserable district church. We sometimes imagine William Warburton, Richard Baxter, John Newton, or Edward Bickersteth, applying for a curacy to some of these worthies, and being refused on the ground that they were not university men; the incumbent, who himself was probably plucked at college, returning after an interview to tell his wife that a Mr. Warburton or a Mr. Newton had been applying for his curacy, but the one was once an attorney's clerk, and the other had been a sailor, neither of them was 'a university man,' and consequently neither of them was a 'gentleman'! A Church like the Church of England should open its arms to educated men, wherever they have obtained their education, and it should support colleges that, of all sorts of material, drawn from all classes of society, will produce *gentlemen of the right kind*.

We have scarcely any space left for the second reason of the scarcity of candidates for the ministry. It is the difficulty of success. This is twofold: the difficulty of getting a living, and the consequent difficulty of getting a sphere in which a man may put forth all his strength. An incumbency in the Church of England is a castle, an impregnable fortress to defend the holder of it, and to bar out all others. This may be for good or evil as the case may be. Now unless a man has a fair prospect of getting an incumbency he is an unwise man if he takes orders in the Church of England. His chances of getting a living by merit are very few. He is a fortunate man

if he ever gets a chance of showing that he has any merit. The men who take orders, then, are those who have livings already provided for them, or whose friends will buy at the first opportunity. This is a very large class. The Church gets their service, such as it is, and they manage to get well paid for it. Another class is those who do well at the university and may fairly calculate on a college living. A third class includes some well-meaning men who have faith either in themselves or in the future, and it also includes the incapables, who, unfit for anything else, get into the Church in virtue of their being University men. With the exception of those who obtain fellowships or take such a position at college as secures their preferment, the really good, that is educated, men of the two Universities do not take orders.

This calculating principle, which prevents men entering the service of the Church because they have no prospect of preferment, Mr. Michell classes among the causes which he ascribes to 'the lowest motives.' We may grant that it does seem a 'low motive' which prevents a man becoming a preacher of the Gospel because he has no prospect of a living. We really ought to sacrifice something for Christ, and unless we are ready to sacrifice all, how can we be *His* disciples? This is very well said, but sacrifice for Christ is not the same as sacrifice to uphold an institution that allows its property to be appropriated, and the care of parishes to be sold to those whose interest it is to buy. The Church of England is a reformed church. It has stringent laws against livings being bought and sold. These laws are violated every day.

The rulers of the Church know this and wink at it. The government of the country knows it and attempts no remedy. It has even come to be supposed that it is for the good of the Church that the livings be in the hands of those who can buy them. For a clergyman to be rich is a better recommendation than for him to be a good preacher or an industrious pastor. Ovid said of the god Terminus that when the capitol was built—

‘Conventus in æde
Restitit, et magno cum Jove templa tenet.’

What the poet says of Terminus is true of another deity. We are becoming established in the faith that there is but one God and that Mammon is His prophet! Mr. Michell admits that it is good reasoning for a man to hesitate to take orders when he sees no prospect of success, yet he recommends sacrifice and even celibacy, pointing to the Catholic clergy. We scarcely think the cases are parallel. The Catholic clergy sacrifice for the good of the Church, and are celibate, from the Pope downwards. Mr. Michell asks some to sacrifice that others may enjoy—some to be celibate that others may have wives, and perchance out of the substance of the Church leave an inheritance to their babes.

THE END.

By the same Author.

Vols. I. and II. Now ready, Vol. III. in March.

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN ENGLAND

FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE END OF LAST CENTURY.

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

3 Vols, Demy 8vo. 21s. each.

"There can hardly be a more interesting subject than the history of religious thought. We therefore welcome with great pleasure the first instalment of a very laborious work by Mr. Hunt. He could scarcely have taken a subject more calculated to repay the labour devoted to it. He is a most industrious worker, honourably anxious to be candid to all parties, and has collected an amount of material which cannot but be useful to future students."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

"Here we have clearness, vigour, and originality of style, and an abundance of new thought. . . . The views of a man who has not only studied his subject, but is a thorough master of it in every part. . . . He is a master in the art of analyzing and condensing the thoughts and opinions of others; and in his biographical sketches of such men as Baxter, Milton, Cranmer, Hooker, George Fox, or Hammond, often manages to give us the pith of the question under discussion in a single page. We look on his present work as evincing talents of a high order; unflinching love of truth, great devoutness, and the boldest reliance on the power and value of reason being conspicuous throughout. The book will attract many thoughtful readers, and reward all who take the trouble to study it with the care and study which it deserves."—*Standard*.

"A more complete and faithful picture of English theology we do not know. The author's mode of treating his subject is very thorough, but at the same time he does what it is difficult enough to do in a book dealing with opinion, he escapes being dull, and has produced a volume which is sure to be extremely attractive to all interested in theological studies, and in watching the growth of freedom of thought."—*English Independent*.

"Mr. Hunt is a very able thinker and critic, commands a terse and very serviceable style for his matter and purpose, is a laborious and conscientious reader and historian, and has accordingly produced a book of great value. His former work is one of real merit, and his reputation will be enhanced by the present instalment of the important history which he has undertaken to write."—*London Quarterly Review*.

"Mr. Hunt has executed his task with much fairness and judgment, and has condensed the results of very extensive reading. The book treats of topics of the utmost importance, which are presented in an interesting manner, so that all persons, whatever may be the nature of their pursuits, who are capable of reading a sensible book, will derive pleasure and instruction from the perusal of it. . . . We shall be glad to welcome the second volume on its appearance, and in the meantime have to thank Mr. Hunt for a very serviceable addition to a library."—*Christian Observer*.

"This work supplies a lack in our historico-theological literature. It not only traces the genesis and development of the successive schools which have ruled realms of religious thought in England for the last three centuries, but it also contains a biographical sketch of the men, and an accurate analysis of the writings of the chief leaders of the schools. . . . We thank Mr. Hunt for a promising instalment of a work the conception of which was most happy; the execution of which bears all the marks of the learning, diligence, and impartiality of the accomplished author; and the contents of which ought to secure for it a place on the shelves of every well-selected library."—*Watchman*.

"We anticipate the remaining portions of the work with satisfaction, and thank Mr. Hunt for a valuable contribution to the history of English thought."—*British Quarterly Review*.

"The idea of the work is a very good one and it is executed in a style terse and clear."—*Record*.

STRAHAN & CO., 56, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

By the same Author.

Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.

AN ESSAY ON PANTHEISM.

"The work of a man indefatigable in his pursuit of truth, not content with second-hand information where it was accessible to him at the fountain-head, making his task a labour of love, and proclaiming his results fearlessly. There is, we believe, no English treatise bringing together the same amount of information, given where it was possible in the words of his authorities and grouped with an instructive clearness."—*Contemporary Review*.

"The subject of this book is one which must always interest thinkers. . . . Mr. Hunt gives sufficient proof that he has read much on the subject, and spared no pains to apprehend its bearings. He has traversed a wide field, scattering his materials over it with a liberal hand. . . . We commend the volume to the favourable attention of the reader, as one deserving his perusal. The author is earnest and devout. He shows that he is an orthodox Churchman, as well as a man of reading and reflection. . . . He is no common-place writer; his book is well fitted to stimulate and enlighten the minds of those who are desirous to be introduced into the illustrious company of thinkers who have pondered over the profound problem of being."—*Athenæum*.

"For particular commendation we should select his account of the doctrine of Scotus Erigena, and especially his vindication, for it amounts to that, of Benedict Spinoza. Mr. Hunt's is a very good style, and well suited for setting before the reader intelligible summaries of philosophical systems which might be laboured into any degree of obscurity. It is concise without being peremptory. . . . He manifests no hostile spirit, and his object is evidently to conciliate. Christianity and Pantheism must be reconciled, otherwise it will be the worse for Christianity."—*Westminster Review*.

"The Curate of St. Ives has redeemed the credit of his order. The Church of Rome has awarded him its most distinguished honour of the Index, in company with Dr. Pusey, and the author of *Ecce Homo!* and we think he is fairly entitled to the distinction from the ability, the patience, and the honesty with which he has conducted the investigation that he felt called to enter upon. In the straightforward and attractive preface, he explains how he came to undertake the task of resolving the great religious question of the day, and how he gradually awoke to the magnitude of the work he had set himself. . . . Mr. Hunt is quite aware of the danger he incurs by his appeal to reason in these matters, but he is one of the few people who see that there is really no help for it, that a man must use his reason, if it is only for the purpose of making up his mind that he won't. In language that frequently rises into eloquence, he maintains the supremacy of the much-abused faculty, and he commends the outcome of his patient labour to the sympathies of those who feel the necessities of the age and appreciate the value of truthful inquiry."—*Spectator*.

"This learned and elaborate work will be hailed with thankfulness by such theological students as take an interest in tracing out, amongst all nations and in all ages, the struggles and developments of human thought in relation to the being and government of God. It will lead devout readers afresh to adore Him, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge"—*Wesleyan Paper*.

"In passing round and over so wide a field, the author has brought out much that is both interesting and curious. Any reader who wishes to master the subject will find all the materials brought together to his hand within the single volume before us; and also reference to many original sources of information."—*Record*.

"It covers a broad field, and occupies a space in English literature before vacant."—*Christian Examiner* (American).

Works by Henry Alford, D.D.

THE LATE DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

The Book of Genesis and part of the
Book of Exodus. A Revised Version with Marginal Refer-
ences, and an Explanatory Commentary. Demy 8vo,
12s.

The New Testament.

Authorised Version Revised. 6s., 3s. 6d., 1s. 6d.

Essays and Addresses,

Chiefly on Church Subjects. Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Year of Prayer :

Being Family Prayers for the Christian Year. Crown 8vo
3s. 6d. ; 12mo, 1s. 6d.

The Week of Prayer :

An abridgment of "The Year of Prayer," intended for use
in Schools. Neat cloth, 9d.

The Year of Praise :

Being Hymns with Tunes, for the Sundays and Holidays
of the Year. 3s. 6d., 1s. 6d., 1s., 6d.

How to Study the New Testament.

In Three Parts. Small 8vo, 3s. 6d. each.

Part I.—The Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles Part II.—
The Epistles (Section I.). Part III.—The Epistles (Section II.)
and the Apocalypse.

Eastertide Sermons.

Preached before the University of Cambridge. Small 8vo,
3s. 6d.

Meditations :

Advent, Creation, Providence. Small 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Works by the Rev. E. H. Plumptre, M.A.

RECTOR OF PLUCKLEY, AND PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

Biblical Studies.

Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Tragedies of Æschylos.

A New Translation, with a Biographical Essay, and an Appendix of Rhymed Choruses. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Tragedies of Sophocles.

A New Translation, with a Biographical Essay, and an Appendix of Rhymed Choruses. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Lazarus, and other Poems.

Crown 8vo, 5s.

Master and Scholar, and other Poems.

Crown 8vo, 5s.

Theology and Life.

Small 8vo, 6s.

Christ and Christendom :

Being the Boyle Lectures for 1866. Demy 8vo, 12s.

Sunday.

8vo, sewed, 6d.

STRAHAN & CO., 56, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.





